



Capital Planning & Development
CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MINUTES

DATE	September 21, 2016
FACILITATOR(S)	David Dodson
MINUTES TAKEN BY	Recorded
ATTENDEES	Anita Azarenko, Mike Bailey, Bill Callender, Ryan Contreras, Trish Daniels, Penny Hardesty, Cathy Kerr, Joe Majeski, Gabriel Merrell, Carl Metz, Deb Mott, Janet Nishihara, Patrick Robinson
STAFF & GUESTS	Leah Hall Dorothy, Dave Fehring, John Gremmels, Joe Schaffer, Tracy Speelhoffer, Brandon Trelstad

PROJECT/CONSTRUCTION UPDATES

John Gremmels informed the committee of the following:

- Johnson Hall – Certificate of occupancy received and occupied. Some work still going on. Fully operable.
- Bexell Hall – Operable, with soft opening. People from CLA are moving into Bexell. The official opening will occur January 2017.
- Access Management Center – Data center. Will carry the emergency circuits for the campus. The other half of the building is an Ag farm services shop.
- New Steam Tunnel – Designing a tunnel with a redundant pipe. Watching for problems. Ready to fire the old heat plant back up if necessary.
 - Joe Majeski commented that there is a newer strategy. To get the old heat plant operational it will be \$250,000 for the gas company to bring the quantity of gas needed. Permitting was challenging also.
- Parking Lots - Just completed and opened an extension of the Energy Center south lot, creating 40 more parking spots. 16th and A lot is in design and projecting winter or spring to be under construction. Starting design for lower campus near the Sunflower House w/ 50 spaces.

10-YEAR FORECAST PLAN PRESENTATION

John Gremmels briefed the committee on the status of the 10-year Capital Forecast. Board of Trustees (BOT) has requested a forecast. It is called a Capital Forecast, as it is a guideline for the future. There is no such thing as an individual project anymore and there never really was. Almost the entire campus was affected by the renovation of Strand Hall. The plan will help give transparency about what OSU’s future is. The method of developing the capital plan has included meetings with all the deans and department leaders discussing their long-term needs. Going forward, the Capital Forecast will be updated every other year. It is a living document. It is a plan for 28,000 students on the ground in Corvallis. There are limits as to how much construction can go on at one time and still have campus a livable and good experience. Some boundary conditions are: \$50 million in OSU paid revenue bonds; \$70 million in State bonds; in addition we are asking for \$35 million in capital renewal funds (deferred maintenance). Capital renewal allows for the updating of buildings, etc. for things such as accessibility and technology. \$60 million in gifts – this number can be a lot more but it can also be a lot less. The

Capital Forecast primarily deals with the main campus not the auxiliaries or athletics. Most of their buildings are not in competition for the same type of funds. Finally, \$35 million in other operating funds, cash on hand, etc. that are not debt. There is an exception for the use of the state debt hat also applies to University Housing and Dining. When they build a new housing complex they will use OSU revenue bonds.

Anita Azarenko explained the process of how these things are being developed. She then shared a flow chart of how involved the process is. She reassured the committee that Capital Planning and Development is an information provider, not the decider. In the past, it has been viewed that decisions were being made without substantive input from the academic side. Anita then went through each item on the flow chart that was provided to the committee.

- Solicit
 - Obtain additional information as needed.
- Review
 - Cost; pro forma review; technical review; high-level sort.
- Compile
 - Beginning of the decision making process is with the Infrastructure Working Group a sub-group of the Provost Council.
- Categorize
 - Recommended categorized list
- Comment and Categorize
 - Feedback from Provost Council & DFA Council, ASOSU, and others as needed.
 - Feasibility Analysis, Categorized List and Comments.
- Propose
 - Proposed Capital Plan
- Recommend
 - Recommended Capital Plan
- Approve (Board of Trustees)
 - Final Capital Plan Approval; Even Years; HECC requests submitted.

There is one caveat. We are now working with financial constraints. Eight metrics have been presented to the BOT. For all of the university expenditures there are lower limits and upper limits where we have to stay.

A committee member asked how CPD gets feedback on things that are outside colleges wanting to put a project forward and other things that people could have comments on. Anita responded that the Provost Council is not limited to colleges. The head of every major unit on campus is at the table. In addition, there is representation within IWG to try to capture that. Suggested rolling any comments up to the person from your group that is on the Provost Council.

John Gremmels finished the presentation by commenting on the IWG's thought process on assembling the Capital Forecast. The two major items that need to be provided are space and quality of space. There are many buildings on campus that have aged but have not been worked on. A lot of the research core and academic core have buildings that are in poor condition. The university is behind about \$700 million in deferred maintenance. Part of the Capital Forecast is a facility condition assessment that assesses all of the buildings and the entire

infrastructure and it gives a facility condition rating. Currently this is done only for the E&G buildings. For some of the buildings it would not make sense to renovate the building. If the cost to renovate is 70% or greater than a new building, there is no reason to renovate the building. OSU legacy buildings would most likely be treated differently. Except for these buildings:

- Snell Hall – There was a plan to raze this building 20-30 years ago. Five years ago CPD was one month away from having an RFP out to have it knocked down. We are in it now, as the space is currently needed. However, it is an old dorm in horrible condition. It would cost as much to fix it as it would to build new.
- Weniger Hall – 1960’s-style science building. It was cost effective to construct. To renovate I’d have to build a structure and then build a shell and then replace the building between it, which sounds a lot like building another building.
- Facilities Shops – Seismically poor. They are in a very poor location.

Seismic safety is a major driver. Any building that is being talked about for renovation will have a seismic component. Strand Ag Hall is a model of renovation for legacy buildings.

A committee member asked Gremmels to define what space realignment means. John responded that space realignment means when you do a renovation you hope to get more efficiency out of the space. Realignment in Kerr would mean if you are an administrative department on campus and would be better off in Kerr, you would move there and free up space on campus for academic growth. Some buildings on campus house 6 or 7 units that are not even aligned by college. Buildings need to be designed so they are resilient into the future meaning that the space can flex.

So how do we demo Weniger? The concept is to build 3-4 science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) buildings that would replace the space and allow for growth. STEM buildings are geared around the research and work not a college/unit.

The IWG wanted to have a way to rate and prioritize projects so they came up with an analytical hierarchy to analyze each project. This includes seismic and life/safety, alignment, physical quality of the building, impact of the project, etc.

The 2017-19 capital projects: Fairbanks Hall renovation, Gilkey Hall renovation, start of the Cordley Hall renovation and a complex in the Ag area for Oregon Quality Foods and Beverages.

In gaining 3,000 students, campus will continue to have less space per student. However, there does not seem to be any current research literature that actually says what the right amount of space is per student. The Campus Master Plan projected 3 million square feet of space would be built during the last ten years, yet only one million additional square feet were built.

The Capital Forecast does not necessarily locate buildings. That is the purview of the Campus Planning Committee. However, building replacements will not necessarily go in the same spot.

Question from committee member: With all the new buildings being built, is there a plan for reserves?

Joe Majeski responded that up until a couple years ago, new building were being built with no additional funding whatsoever. A few years back it was determined that Facilities would receive \$9.60 per square foot allocated for every new building to maintain and operate the building. This does not address upgrading over a 30-50 year period but it does address the day-to-day maintenance aspects of the building, which is a huge increase for Facilities.

Anita Azarenko commented that what it does not address is sub-systems that fail before the life of the building (50 years). This includes systems such a networking (5-6 years), HVAC (22 years), etc. There are 4 sub-systems that will fail before the end of the life of the building. Currently we do not have a mechanism to create a reserve fund for replacement of those sub-systems. However, there will be a proposal before the IWG to set up a Stewardship Fund to be able to put money aside to cover a set of the sub-systems within a building. The dilemma is that if you have a state-funded building exclusively, you are not allowed to set aside/save funds.

PRIDE CENTER SITE APPROVAL (ACTION REQUIRED) – Presented by David Dodson

Cindy Konrad, Assistant Director of the Pride Center is here with us today.

The Pride Center is one of seven cultural resource centers on campus and is located along A Avenue near 16th Street.

The Center is interested in expanding and upgrading their facility to include a resource library, room for classes, conference and community meetings and accessibility. Any addition would likely be to the west.

The project may trigger transportation improvements along A Avenue.

Planning staff is recommending approval of the site request with 3 conditions dealing with building scale, maintaining a street oriented entry, and the building design to come back before the CPC for schematic design approval.

One committee member asked about the location of the Pride Center and why it is not located closer to the core of Campus. Cindy Konrad replied that it is very accessible and that there is a level of comfort to many people who do not want to be seen going into the Pride Center.

Joe Majeski asked for clarification of what constitutes the protected space as far as the 2002 covenant; is it the Pride Center proper or is the entire site currently protected and will that protection then extend into this larger space?

David Dodson responded that he would have to look back on how the covenant was written as it was before his time at OSU.

Cindy Konrad commented that she has a copy of the covenant but did not think it delineated a specific land area but speaks to the location of the cultural center. Cindy will email a copy to David Dodson to be disseminated to the committee with the meeting minutes, etc.

A motion to accept site approval was made and seconded.

Majority approved; one opposed (Joe Majeski). Motion carried.

SOUTH FARM REC SPORTS FIELDS SITE APPROVAL (ACTION REQUIRED) – Presented by David Dodson

Bill Callender is here representing Rec Sports.

The Department of Recreational Sports is requesting site approval for nine sports fields and a parking lot at South Farm which is south of Philomath Boulevard along Brooklane Drive. The first phase of the project will consist of 3 fields and 16 parking spaces. The second phase will include 6 additional fields and 30 additional parking spaces.

Some of you may be familiar with this project, as it received site approval back in 2011; however, that approval was good for 3 years and has expired.

Currently there are two outdoor sport field sites used for their programs: Student Legacy Park and Peavy Field. Both Women's Building and South Intramural Fields have been lost to development since the original request in June of 2011.

South farm is a 50-acre property that is primarily used by animal sciences. Roughly, 1/3 of the property is within the 100-year floodplain, which precludes new building construction. This is where 3 of the fields and the parking lot is proposed. The uplands, outside the floodplain is where the remaining 6 fields are proposed. The location of the fields in the second phase may require some wetland mitigation. Any activity on this location in the future would need to have an archeologist on site or available to respond to any concerns that may come up in case something is found or disturbed on the site.

Planning staff is recommending approval of the site request with one condition indicating the project will be required to provide its fair share street and sidewalk improvements along the Brooklane Drive frontage.

Joe Majeski asked if there were any restroom facilities being planned. Bill Callender responded they would use porta potties.

There was a brief discussion regarding the location and whether students would actually use the fields. Clubs may initially use this space rather than intramural sports that run from 3:00 – 11:00 pm. Dixon Rec has capped their club and program activities because they have no more space. With the diverse population of students, activity habits are changing. There is more of an interest in cricket, hurling, and other activities. The activities are also becoming more informal. The need for this space is driven by the increased demand on the current programs and as a fall back space for future development. It will allow for both program and informal space. If this space were available and developed, it would be full today.

Deb Mott posed the following question: Is the south lawn lower campus off limits to any development?

David Dodson responded that it is not off limits but it is within the historic district. It needs to remain like it is. There is an opportunity for it to accommodate those same activities, as it is a large grass lawn; however, it is very wet during the winter months.

There is no lighting included in the current proposal.

A motion to accept site approval was made and seconded.

Majority approved; one recusal; one opposed. Motion carried.

COB GRADUATE SCHOOL SITE APPROVAL RENEWAL (ACTION REQUIRED) – Presented by David Dodson

Tracy Speelhoffer from the College of Business is here in case the committee has any questions.

In January of 2008, the CPC granted site approval for the new College of Business Building. Site approval was renewed in 2011 and the first phase of the College of Business developed Austin Hall. It was completed in 2013. A second phase of development is planned for the site, but the project is still in the development phase.

Site Approval for Phase II was granted by the CPC in January of 2014. The approved site is located north of Austin Hall along Sackett Place.

The College of Business is requesting a three-year extension of the 2014 site approval. No modifications have been made to the previous proposal.

Joe Majeski asked how the addition of the new classroom building affects the plans for this building. Has that space been calculated in?

Traci Speelhoffer responded that they are planning on increasing enrollment. The Austin Hall classrooms are College of Business classrooms so COB does not have many classes in the LInC building currently. The new space will compensate for the fact that not as many classrooms were included in Austin Hall as the COB originally wanted to include and for increased enrollment in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

There was discussion regarding a recent classroom utilization study, which looked at all the general classrooms and unit/departmental-specific classrooms. Currently campus is functioning at 46% of classroom utilization efficiency, which is considered moderate according to standards. Unit-specific classrooms are at about 25% utilization. So, are there other spaces on campus that could be used in lieu of this new space?

Currently the new COB building is not on the 10-year Capital Forecast.

COB has new leadership and intends to move forward with this building eventually so they want to keep this on the radar.

A number of concerns were raised regarding alternate spaces that could be used, sustainability issues, no sharing of systems with Austin Hall and the size of the proposed building and how it will impact the courtyard. If a

building were to be built on this site, great attention should be paid to how the existing courtyard is preserved. 70,000 square feet is a significant building. Is this putting the cart before the horse as this relates to the Capital Forecast? The current site approval expires in December 2016. If this is not included in the 10-year Capital Forecast, can the committee vote to renew this site approval? Some committee members are uncomfortable doing so. How can the COB get this building on the 10-year Capital Forecast?

David Dodson reminded the committee that the request before them was not approving the building on the site but is to reserve the site. The COB will be obligated to come back to the committee if they get to a place to where they have funding and have a building design, it will then be review by the CPC for consideration for schematic approval. This current site approval is for 3 years from the date of site approval. The committee can choose to defer a decision on the site renewal at this time to allow CPD time to look closer at the issues that have been brought up during this meeting.

A motion was made to defer the decision on this site renewal to a future meeting and at the same time to not consider any other site approval request for this particular site during that time, and was seconded.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVE JULY 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve the July 20, 2016 meeting minutes was made and seconded.

Motion carried.

NEXT MEETING: DECEMBER 21, 2016 2:00 – 4:00 PM; ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 pm.