

<p><b>UAF Master Planning Committee Meeting Agenda</b></p> <p>Thursday, July 9, 2009; 9 – 11 a.m. Chancellor’s Conference Room; Signers’ Hall Room 330</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Welcome and Introductions</li> <li>2) Old University Park Building Site &amp; Contiguous Lands</li> <li>3) CCHRC Expansion and Addition: Jonathan Shambare</li> <li>4) ATCO Units for AHRB: Jonathan Shambare</li> <li>5) Subcommittee Report: Campus Landscape and Outdoor Art</li> <li>6) Subcommittee Report: Circulation and Parking</li> <li>7) Subcommittee Report: North Campus</li> <li>8) Facilities Services Update</li> <li>9) Public Comment Period</li> </ol>
--	--

**Master Planning Committee Meeting**

July 9, 2009

Notes

**Attending:** Deb Horner, Rich Boone, Jonathan Shambare, Dianne Milke, Lydia Anderson, Joe Hayes, Hans Nielsen, Ian Olson (8 total)

**Guests:** Frank Williams, Rick Caulfield, Eric Madsen, Mike Ruckhaus, Kellie Fritze, Linda Zanazzo, Tom Bacckart, Luke Hopkins

**Old University Park Building Site & Adjacent Lands**

Jonathan gave an overview of the process to evaluate the use of Old UPark and adjacent lands. UAF Design and Construction contracted McCool, Carlson, and Green Architects (Anchorage) to provide an assessment; one of the planners Michael Carlson joined the meeting via polycom and gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the evaluation criteria and four possible options (A-D) for the building and the adjacent lands.

Deb asked whether the need for classroom space was included.

Answer: Yes

Deb pointed out that Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension could benefit from site synergy. The use of Skarland Hall is still unclear.

Luke asked if the multipurpose area is part of the portion marked for 911 responder training and if parking needs were considered.

Answer: Yes to both

Frank asked if land grant restrictions were considered with respect to use of the tech park.

Mike Ruckhaus and Kellie Fritze responded yes and that the tech park may not meet the land grant requirements.

Michael went over the calculations of parking needs.

Luke asked if locating the data center underground was considered.

Answer: Michael responded that it wasn't considered because of lack of information on soils and the water table but that locating the data center underground would be a possibility.

Rick pointed out that the estimate of 40-50 children for the childcare center is low; the need may be double that. There are currently 30 children in Bunnell House.

Michael said that he used the Borough's zoning requirement of 1 parking space/200 ft<sup>2</sup> building space. Deb pointed out that the Borough's standards for parking are under scrutiny; they are overinflated and based on a maximum number of shoppers at a peak shopping period.

Luke pointed out that transit connections on campus are another consideration.

Ian mentioned that accommodation of foot traffic should be considered.

Michael pointed out that a survey would be needed to better determine parking needs.

Michael reviewed Schematic SA.

Rich asked if the entire property in the schematic is land that UAF leases to the Fairbanks North Star Borough.

Answer: Yes, all but Old UPark.

Michael reviewed Schematic A.

The assumption for this scheme is that the Old UPark site is the only site available.

Rick pointed out that there is a need to ensure that the character of different entities (e.g., FNSBSD vs. UAF) is recognized in any design. How can those separate identities be handled within a common facility?

Michael said that other schemes provide for more distinct institutional identities.

Joe asked if there are drawbacks to a compact facility. Is it the most cost effective?

Michael said that there are challenges to a common facility:

- \* Little space for landscaping
- \* Difficult to build a 4-story building in phases, if phasing is required due to funding sequencing

Tom pointed out that the data center will need backup power from a generator; this may not be compatible with other uses in a common facility.

Michael reviewed Schematic B.

Luke asked if the data center would be located within the current footprint of the west wing of Old UPark.

Answer: No. Phase 1 of the data center could be constructed without any demolition of Old UPark.

Rick pointed out the value of the track area; it includes the football field. Both Hutchison and West Valley High School use the fields.

Eric asked if keeping one wing of Old UPark is viable.

Answer (Linda): The west wing of Old UPark will need to be demolished. The other two wings are under consideration for removal.

Deb pointed out that area north of West Valley High School may be inappropriate for the multi-use field (shown in the schematic) because the area is very wet.

Michael reviewed Schematic D (a variation of Option C)

The data center would be located to the east of the visualization center.

Eric Madsen, Dean of the School of Education, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the School of Education and its space needs.

Deb asked if teacher preparation is part of the UA system.

Answer (Madsen): Yes

Luke asked if School of Education space will be impacted if the west wing of Old UPark is demolished.

Answer (Deb): Perhaps, depending on what is done in Skarland Hall.

Ian suggested that an all-in-one location might be possible for the School of Education.

The next steps in the overall evaluation of Old UPark and adjacent lands were discussed.

Luke suggested a work session.

Rich asked about the time constraints regarding ARSC funding.

Linda Zanazzo responded that the timing constraints have been relaxed some and that resolution of the use of Old UPark and adjacent lands could wait until the end of August.

Dianne asked about MPC's responsibility with respect to use of building sites.

Deb replied that the MPC has always reviewed plans for buildings and provided comment.

Luke asked if another site in the community is being considered for ARCS.

Answer (Linda): Yes

Tom Bacckart offered that the time critical element for ARSC has been relaxed because a new site has been identified for the new supercomputer equipment.

Rich urged that there is need to determine the best use of MPC's time given that information about the situation is changing and not all available.

Linda offered that a plan is not as time critical.

Deb said MPC needs to identify the best and highest use of the Old UPark site, but we need to factor in the Skarland Hall issue.

Dianne asked if we will have more information about Skarland Hall by the next MPC meeting.

Answer (Linda): Yes.

Rick C. said it would be very helpful to TVC if the use of Old UPark is resolved in the near term.

The issue of Old UPark will be considered further at the next MPC meeting, which is scheduled August 13, although a special meeting before that date is possible.

**Cold Climate Housing Research Center (CCHRC) Addition – Jonathan Shambare**

CCHRC would like to double its footprint of leased land in order to use adjacent forested land for research.

Deb asked if UAF is satisfied that contractual and code issues have been met to date.

Answer (Linda): There were some code problems, but they are being addressed.

Luke suggested that UAF could include lease stipulations. Cutting of trees? Any restrictions?

Deb suggested that a silvicultural plan could be required.

Motion from Joe (seconded by Ian):

The MPC approves the proposed CCHRC addition site, including the completion of a silvicultural plan (developed with UAF) for the forested area in the footprint.

Motion passed unanimously 8-0.

### **ATCO Units – Jonathan Shambare**

Jonathan reviewed plans to establish one ATCO unit to the west of the Arctic Health Research Building (AHRB) and one to the north of the O’Neill Building. The ATCO units are needed for the increasing number of science graduate students.

The MPC discussed the placement of the units.

Motion from Deb (seconded by Joe):

The MPC recommends placement of two ATCO units west of the Arctic Health Research Building, placing one unit farther to the south to minimize impact on the existing picnic area to the north. MPC also approves placement of an ATCO unit to the north of the O’Neill Building.

Motion approved unanimously 8-0

**Subcommittee Reports** – deferred until next meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 11:20A.

Next MPC meeting is scheduled for August 13, 2009.