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AGENDA ITEM: Real Estate: Strategy, Tactics, and Vision

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Michael Berthelsen, Interim Vice President, University Services
Michael Volna, Associate Vice President & Controller
Susan Carlson Weinberg, Director of Real Estate
Sarah Harris, Managing Director, UMF Real Estate Advisors

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to discuss the strategy, tactics, and vision for the University's acquisition and use of real estate and the interaction between the University and the UMF regarding real estate.

Two of the University's key resources for delivering its mission are people and space. An important consideration with regard to space is the land on which it sits, whether that is owned or leased. Competition for real estate varies across the state, but around the Twin Cities campus, land that was once inexpensive and plentiful has become scarce and expensive. The University and UMF, as independent strategic partners, are working to ensure that the land resources exist to deliver the institution’s mission and goals. Both entities are also working to ensure that real estate is used to its fullest potential to build a successful, connected, full community around the University.

The committee will hear about and discuss the principles that are used to examine whether a specific situation is best served through purchase, lease, partnership, or sale of property. University real estate decisions are informed by the various master plans and district plans, as well as any neighborhood or area plans adopted by the communities in which the University is located.

The committee will also hear about and discuss current strategies and principles that support the financing of real estate acquisition. This will include an overview of the University's real estate office (REO) and the role it plays in partnerships with the University, its surrounding communities, and the private sector real estate community that influences the edges of campus. This item will also cover how outside influences near University property influence decisions and planning.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

University Real Estate Office

The University's real estate office (REO) is charged with providing leadership for the University system with regard to its land holdings, acquisitions, dispositions, and leases. With a staff of 10 reporting to the University's senior vice president for finance and operations, REO has stewardship responsibility for over 28,300 acres of owned land comprising five campuses and over 40 facilities. REO is also responsible for over 400 long-term leases for University use of 806,000 square feet of space and 2,650 acres of land. REO manages all leases for use of University property and facilities by external parties.

University of Minnesota Foundation Real Estate Advisors

The UMF Real Estate Advisors (REA) was established in 2008 to manage UMF’s real estate assets and to advise on real estate strategies, gifts, and investments that serve to enhance the University. With a management staff of six reporting to the UMF President and CEO (serving as Chair of its Board), the REA makes strategic investments that enhance the communities surrounding campuses. REA focuses on the double-bottom line of maximizing return on investment while contributing to vibrant neighborhoods, reflecting their role as a strategic partner in advancing the University.
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- University Real Estate Office (REO)
- University of Minnesota Foundation Real Estate Advisors (UMFREA)
- REO and REA Partnership
- Policy Questions for the Board
Real Estate Office: Mission

- Provide real estate leadership for the University of Minnesota system and exceptional professional services to realize the highest and best use of the University’s real estate assets in support of its mission.
- Bring strategic value to University decision-making by defining optimal approaches to solving real estate requirements and maximizing asset use.
Real Estate Office: Organization and Scope

- 28,300 acres of land
  - 5 campuses
  - 40 sites
- 400 long-term leases
  - 806,000 sf
  - 2,650 acres of land
- Manages leases for use of U property by external parties
Real Estate Office: Responsibilities

- Stewardship for the University’s owned and leased real estate portfolio
- Management of non-campus properties
- Real estate acquisitions and dispositions
- Real estate lease transactions and lease management
- Management of business relationship with University real estate joint venture partner
- In partnership with UMore Development Director, management of UMore Park land sales for development purposes
Acquisition of Real Estate

- The University acquires real estate when
  - Required for projects based on 6-Year Capital Plan
  - Available within boundaries of campus master plans
  - An “opportunistic” purchase becomes available, and potential use can be identified

- The University uses eminent domain
  - only if necessary to meet a clear public purpose
Sale or Lease of Real Estate

• The University leases real estate when
  – short-term need (ex. grants/contracts)
  – lower total cost compared to ownership

• The University sells real estate when
  – no current or future mission-related use identified
University Partnerships

• A public-private partnership (P3) is appropriate when the outcome is better than the partners acting alone
  – Private sector party’s technical and professional skills and assets are needed and can be leveraged to achieve University goals
  – Risks and rewards can be shared
  – Desirable measure of control can be retained

• 2407 Joint Venture
  – 51% United Properties (managing partner), 49% University
Financing Real Estate

- **Internal financing**
  - cash, internal loan
- **Debt**
  - general obligation, special purpose, assumption of debt
- **Gifts**
  - cash, property, or donation in lieu of cash
- **Leases**
  - ie. student housing master leases
- **Public/Private Partnerships**
  - ie. 2407 LLC joint venture
History - Jim Cargill Gift

Gift

• 2008 - 2012 Gift
• Specifically to Foundation
• Intent: Support students with quality, affordable housing
• Debt-free, built to last, well-located

UMFREA

• Focus:
  • Managing
  • Advising
  • Investing in place
• Subsidiary of Foundation
Expert Governance

Advisory Council

- **Stuart Ackerberg**, President and CEO, The Ackerberg Group
- **Dan Avchen**, Executive Director of Strategic Growth, HGA
- **Chris (Kit) Dahl**, General Partner, Forum Investment Group, LLC
- **Fred Friswold***, UMF Investment Advisors and University Gateway Corporation
- **Doug Gorence‡**, CEO, UMF Investment Advisors
- **John Griffith**, Commissioner, Minnesota Sports Facility Authority, Head of Global Operations, American Refugee Committee, former EVP Real Estate, Target Corporation
- **Larry Laukka**, President, Laukka Jarvis
- **Ross Levin***‡, Principal, Accredited Investors
- **Lisa Moe**, President & CEO, Stuart Companies
- **Jim Nelson**, Principal, Eberhardt Advisory

Governance Board

- **Jack Rice**, Owner, The Rice Company
- **Doug Seylar**, SVP and Managing Director CBRE/Capital Markets
- **Bob Strachota**, President, Shenehon Company
- **Jim Stolpestad**, Chairman, Exeter Realty Company

*U of M Foundation Board Member ‡U of M Foundation Officer
Role

Managing
• Dinnaken Portfolio
  • 4 student housing buildings
  • 975 beds
  • $2.5M missional discount
  • 14 apartments for hospital families
  • 45 Student Employees
  • Co-lab Office
  • Dinnaken Scholarship
• Commercial Properties

Advising & Investing
• Greek Loan Program
• Glensheen
• UMore
• Student Housing Taskforce
• Towerside District
U – UMFREA Collaboration

Current

- Monthly Update Meetings
- Project Specific
  - Transportation Study
  - Towerside
  - Glensheen
  - UMore
  - Housing taskforce
  - SYE Housing initiative
- Gift Assessment

Go Forward

- Area Master Plan & Strategy
  - U-Core needs
  - Mixed-use ‘complete’ experience
  - World-class public realm
  - Connected places
  - Private sector partnering
REO and UMFREA: Strategic Partners

• REO focus is the real estate portfolio required to achieve the University’s mission
  – driven by the campus boundaries and future expected campus expansion as defined in master plans
  – as needed for future projects in the Six-Year Capital Plan
• UMFREA focus includes building a real estate portfolio that optimizes net cash flow to further the UMF and U missions
  – serves to enhance the safety, viability, and vibrancy of the community surrounding the campus
  – leverage private sector investments in areas near campus
Policy Questions

1) What is an appropriate planning horizon for the REO and the REA?
2) How much will the University’s footprint grow?
3) What are the tradeoffs between net new growth vs repurposing existing property?
4) What impacts can be expected due to changes in place-based learning?
5) What strategies will be needed to finance the real estate portfolio required by the University’s mission?
6) What is the role of mixed-use and public realm in creating a “complete campus?”
DISCUSSION
AGENDA ITEM: East Gateway: Issues and Interests

PRESENTERS: Monique MacKenzie, Director of Planning, Capital Planning and Project Management
Sarah Harris, Managing Director, UMF Real Estate Advisors

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The eastern edge of the Twin Cities campus is an area of rapid growth and change. What was once an area dominated by grain and rail is now an area in transformation. The committee will hear about and discuss the East Gateway and areas east – an area roughly defined by Oak Street on the west, University Avenue on the south, Minnesota Highway 280 on the east, and rail yards on the north.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

University growth is informed by the 2009 campus master plan. Following its adoption, a district plan was developed for this area called the East Gateway. The district plan also laid out how the area might provide a compatible and distinctive built environment, optimize land and facility use, create a cohesive and memorable system of public spaces, and develop in an environmentally and operationally sustainable way. Capital Planning and Project Management’s 2016 development framework identifies this area for advancing the University’s outreach mission and integrating campus and community edges.

Towerside Innovation District

In addition to University plans, the City of Minneapolis has adopted a Stadium Village Station Area plan included in its 2011 comprehensive plan. This area plan connects the visions of the University and the neighborhood. It was developed with support of the University and Hennepin County. One key area in that plan is the Towerside Innovation District (formerly known as Prospect North.)

Towerside is an intentional partnership to deliver on a community-born vision to build a national model of a thriving community to “live, work, learn, research, and engage” through development, redevelopment, and marketing of 370 acres of land east of 23rd Avenue with multiple owners.
In the Towerside district, initiatives are underway to develop district stormwater (completed), district greenspace, and a district energy solution, as well as a new green 4th Street that stretches from TCF Bank Stadium to Malcolm Avenue (the Surly Brewing intersection). As the vision unfolds, district parking will be another important component of this area.

Beyond the University's current role of investing in the Biomedical Discovery District and recruiting world-class researchers and students, the Towerside district has asked the University to:

- participate and help ensure the joint venture site is compatible with the Towerside's Green 4th plans;
- help plan needed infrastructure north of the University's transitway;
- participate in the Green 4th maintenance district;
- consider district energy for the joint venture site and other properties with University ownership; and
- engage to identify needed crossing(s) of the University's transitway.

The University is also leading a transportation study in this area.

When fully realized, Towerside has the potential to attract thousands of research jobs, housing units, new retail opportunities, and commercial space sought by companies wishing to locate near the University’s investments in research and biomedical discovery.

**Stadium Village**

The transition from University to community begins in Stadium Village. The University's joint venture with United Properties sits in this area at the intersection of Huron Boulevard and University Avenue. Still in the analysis stage, the joint venture partnership has the potential to introduce public and private mixed-use office, retail, and hotel development. Moving east, the University owns land where the Electric Steel and Kurth elevators are located. The University’s ownership extends east along its transitway. The transitway is a dedicated transit corridor that connects the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.

**University District Alliance**

The University District Alliance (UDA) is charged with making the area surrounding the campus vibrant, healthy, safe, and sustainable by working in partnership between neighborhoods, business associations, institutions, and municipal jurisdictions. As market influences in this area change, it is more important than ever that these visions work to complement one another.

Following recent developments around the Electric Steel Elevator property, the World Expo bid, and the Towerside district, the UDA has created a task force to determine common ground for what constitutes collaborative planning. The task force includes representation from the University, the City of Minneapolis, surrounding neighborhoods, business associations, and students. It is anticipated that the task force will complete its work by the end of January 2017, with the hope of producing a better mutual understanding of a shared process with regard to property in this area.
Orientation

UMN East Gateway

Towerside District

*map is an approximate representation of boundaries and does not imply ownership or control by the University or any other specific parties
University District Alliance

• Goal: to make the area surrounding the University of Minnesota campus in Minneapolis one that
  – capitalizes on its exceptional resources
  – is vibrant, safe, healthy, sustainable
  – is a preferred place for people of all ages to live, work, learn, do business, and visit

• Membership: neighborhoods, business associations, student organization, University of MN, Augsburg College, City of Minneapolis
Campus Development Framework (2016)

1. ADVANCE OUTREACH MISSION
   - Prioritize human scale medium-density development.
   - Improve the pedestrian experience.
   - Connect the AHC and the BDD.
   - Locate clinical facilities and potential new hospital.
   - Acquire land strategically.

2. REINFORCE THE TRANSIT CORRIDOR
   - Prioritize mixed-use development.
   - Activate the street edge.
   - Stitch together East and West Banks.
   - Design a pedestrian-friendly environment.
   - Create a distinct identity.

3. INTEGRATE CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY EDGES
   - Participate in efforts in joint planning areas.
   - Define land use patterns and density in context.
   - Determine new build sites and decommission/demolition candidates.
   - Improve safe routes to and through campus.
Distribution of Health Sciences District (2008)
Programmatic need: AHC facility investment

Invests in identity of the institution along edges of the campus where it meets the broader community
Stadium Village Plan (2011)

- Activity Center designation
- Mixed Use, high intensity development
- Transit and pedestrian focus
- Unmet retail demand
- Housing demand expected
Joint Venture (2013)
Joint Venture: Principles and Themes

- Support University needs
- Be supported by market-driven demand
- Advance campus image
- Contribute to a vibrant urban activity center
- Promote durable attractive design and construction
Joint Venture: Site Plan Concept

Design/Planning Principles

- Solve for parking on site
- Address stormwater requirements
- Respond to urban conditions
- Phase development over time
- Test private market for interest in office-tech, hotel
Boundaries

- Two Cities
- 3 LRT Stations
- 370 Acres
The new century nexus of live, work, learn, research, and engage.

An intentional partnership of developers, businesses, community residents, higher education, non-profit and government agencies fueling job growth, redevelopment and innovation adjacent to the University of Minnesota.

A national model for developing a thriving community.
From Here to There
Regional Objectives

- Talent retention and recruitment
- Economic competitiveness and growth
- Equity
- Health
- Vitality
- Connectedness
- Sustainability and resiliency
Objectives Delivered

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
- Property Taxes
- Jobs
- New & Expanded Businesses
- Spending Outputs

**ADDED DIMENSIONS**
- Focus on arts and sciences
- Healthy design and programming
- Life-long learning community
- Demonstration area for research
- Increased creative vitality index

**DEVELOPMENT**
- Mixed use – live/work/learn/research/play
- Diversity of people and uses
- Integrated uses
- Historic Structures
- Green spaces & plazas
- Complete streets & mobility
- Regional connections & adjacencies
- Natural systems
- Community gardens

**INTEGRATED DISTRICT SYSTEMS**
- Eco District
- District energy
- District stormwater
- District parking
- District Restorative infrastructure
- Carbon Footprint Reductions
Assets

- University of Minnesota adjacency (multi-billion $ anchor)
- Significant regional transit and transportation investments
- 3 LRT Stations
- 70+ acres of underdeveloped land
- Important area businesses, old and new

Regional:
  - Central to Metro Area
  - Between 2 Downtowns
  - 2 City and 2 County opportunity

- Missing link in Minneapolis & St. Paul Grand Rounds
- Neighborhood led vision
- Broad stakeholder support via District partnership
University Role

UNIVERSITY

- Support vibrant & safe area
- Continue $1B++ investment anchoring District’s western edge
  - Bio-Discovery District
  - Athletic Campus
  - Joint Venture with United Properties
- Encourage private sector development (keep most property on the tax-rolls)
- Leverage research stature to corporate investment in area
- Recruit and employ research experts

FOUNDATION’S REAL ESTATE

- Provide leadership to private sector to achieve vibrant and safe area
  - Build opportunity awareness
  - Convene
  - Planning support and expertise
  - Advocacy
Under-Developed
Strong Existing Assets

(1) University Biomedical Discovery District - Winston and Maxine Wallin Medical Biosciences Building, Center for Magnetic Resonance Research, Microbiology Research Facility and Cancer and Cardiovascular Research Building (pictured) and Lions Research Building and McGuire Translational Research Facility; (2) Athletics Campus – TCF Bank Stadium (pictured), Williams Arena, Ridder Arena, Mariucci Arena; (3) Central, multi jurisdictional location; (4) Diverse and active community; (5) LRT Green Line; (6) Area Businesses Commercial, Industrial, Entertainment and Cultural, including Surly Brewery (pictured); (7) 25+ private, public and non-profit stakeholders in partnership to plan, implement and achieve District objectives.
Who’s Participating

- Aeon
- BlueCross BlueShield of Minnesota
- City of Minneapolis
- City of St. Paul
- CenterPoint Energy
- Central Funders Collaborative
- The Cornerstone Group
- Creative Enterprise Zone Action Committee
- Dorsey & Whitney LLP
- Ever-Green Energy
- Family Housing Fund & TC Land Bank
- Greater MSP
- Harlem Irving
- Hennepin County
- McKnight Foundation
- Metropolitan Design Center
- Metropolitan Council
- Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- Minneapolis Public Housing Authority
- Mississippi WMO
- Prospect Park 2020 (Community Liaison)
- Prospect Park Association
- Prospect Park Properties (Barnhart Family)
- Surly Brewing
- St. Anthony Park Community Council
- Trust for Public Land
- U of M College of Design
- ULI Minnesota & ULI National
- University of Minnesota
- UMFREA
- United Properties
- University Enterprise Laboratories (UEL)
- The Wall Companies
- Xcel Energy

Staff: UMFREA (Partnership) Kimble Consulting (Implementation)
Implementation: Infrastructure/Access/Public Realm

Integrated systems:

- Green 4th Street
- Shared Stormwater
- Signature Greenspace
- Energy
- Transportation
- Parking
Green Fourth Street

- Enhanced Streetscape by Snow Krelich
- Green 2.3 acre ‘back yard’ to District
- Backbone of Green network
- Connects 29th LRT to TCF Bank Stadium
- Connects social and signature green spaces
- Innovative Storm-water features
- Pedestrian & Bike primary
Signature Green Space

- Privately Owned Public Space “POPS”
- Extension of Green Line plaza
- Part of area grouping of parks
- Integrated with District Systems
- Innovation Welcome
- Accessible to All
District Stormwater

- Private Shared System
- Water Re-Use
- Funding by Private Developers and MWMO
- Part of the Signature Greenspace
- Phase I: Construction 2016
District Energy

- Phase I: heating & cooling
- Renewable source: sanitary sewer
- More renewables over time
- Reduced Construction Cost (Developer)
- Reduced footprint for HVAC (Landlord)
- Reduced energy costs (Landlord/Tenant)
- Reduced emissions (up to 40%)
- Financeable in capital markets
District Transportation & Parking

Met Council Parking Study (Summer 2016)
- Location of reservoirs
- Phasing
- Ownership and management models
- New and flexible structures
- Estimated project cost
- Mobility (parking alternative) options

Area Wide Traffic Study (Late 2016)
- U of M lead, participation by Cities & PNP
- Big picture – all modes
- Issues
  - Trucks (Quantity and access w/LRT constraints)
  - U of M Transit-way
  - Existing and Growth Capacity
  - Circulation
Momentum is Real

- Recent, Current, & Near term Development
- Actively Marketing
Good to Great Assumptions

- 45 acres: sites most ready for development in core area
  (Harlem Irving, Prospect Pk. Properties, Wall, United Properties, Aeon, Cornerstone, US Post Office, and Baillon)
- Good: Development based on current market
- Great: development with the following:
  - Integrated district systems (energy, parking, stormwater, etc.)
  - Enhanced public realm and street grid
  - Enhanced density
# Good to Great Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45 CORE ACRES</th>
<th>GOOD (Market)</th>
<th>GREAT (District)</th>
<th>DISTRICT IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Housing Units</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Units</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Research SF</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>1,683,000</td>
<td>1,286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>200,500</td>
<td>84,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery SF</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Industrial/O-WH SF</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>307,098</td>
<td>161,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space (acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit ridership</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>By project</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street grid</td>
<td>Existing (minimal)</td>
<td>New streets</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Good to Great Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45 CORE ACRES</th>
<th>GOOD (Market)</th>
<th>GREAT (District)</th>
<th>DISTRICT IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Jobs</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>7,218</td>
<td>4,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Jobs</td>
<td>5,476</td>
<td>15,496</td>
<td>10,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$193.8M</td>
<td>$486.9M</td>
<td>$293.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessable Market Value</td>
<td>$216.5M</td>
<td>$560.6M</td>
<td>$344.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td>$27.3M</td>
<td>$79.7M</td>
<td>$52.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$19.8M</td>
<td>$57.3M</td>
<td>$37.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Wages/Year (Direct)</td>
<td>$70,899</td>
<td>$76,164</td>
<td>$5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Impact – County*</td>
<td>$272.2M</td>
<td>$799.8M</td>
<td>$527.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $ Impact – MSA*</td>
<td>$346.5M</td>
<td>$1,027.6M</td>
<td>$681.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited impact</th>
<th>National model of compelling place-making via integrated development, new technologies and increased tax base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The whole is greater than the sum of the parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increase in economic impact measured by GDP. Analysis by Hickey & Associates and Northland Financial.
## Here to there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Stormwater</td>
<td>Green 4th St (Designed, Maintenance Dist. Established)</td>
<td>Green 4th St (build 25th – Malcolm)</td>
<td>Greenway across University Ave</td>
<td>Phase II District Energy planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Energy</td>
<td>District Energy (Pre – eng. funding)</td>
<td>Phase II District Stormwater (MWMO) planned</td>
<td>Development opens: AEON, Harlem Irving’s “The Rise”</td>
<td>Granary Corridor and additional access roads built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Management</td>
<td>Phase I District Stormwater (MWMO) constructed</td>
<td>Signature green space (land acquired, community engagement for Program)</td>
<td>District Energy Phase I opens</td>
<td>Planning for CHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Parking</td>
<td>West Core (Private Development begins)</td>
<td>District Energy (Preliminary Engineering)</td>
<td>East Core Public Public Realm construction starts</td>
<td>Phase I District Parking opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street grid</td>
<td>East Core (Workgroup Established and private development underway))</td>
<td>Other Private Developments begin</td>
<td>West Core Park Construction starts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature green spaces</td>
<td>Signature Green Space (“POPS” established)</td>
<td>Towerside legal entity established</td>
<td>Signature green space developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual City Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Grid plans established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRIVATE SECTOR</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC SECTOR</strong></th>
<th><strong>UNIVERSITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increase mixed-use density on site</td>
<td>- Establish District</td>
<td>- Transit-way crossing(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase design standards</td>
<td>- Project Manager to support development</td>
<td>- Integration of the JV site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainability &amp; Resiliency Standards</td>
<td>- Policies</td>
<td>- Participate in district energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New kinds of mixed-use &amp; flexible space</td>
<td>- New shared private sector storm-water program</td>
<td>- Help plan needed infrastructure where none exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinated site plans</td>
<td>- Shared public/private sector storm-water (future)</td>
<td>- Market Towerside to private research partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participate in District</td>
<td>- Integrated zoning</td>
<td>- Participate in Green 4th maintenance district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Stormwater</td>
<td>- District Greenspace and Parking planning and funding</td>
<td>- Continued investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Parking</td>
<td>- Support</td>
<td>- Bio-Discovery District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Energy</td>
<td>- Local, regional, state &amp; federal funding applications</td>
<td>- Athletics campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Greenspace</td>
<td>- Traffic studies &amp; management (grid expansion, trucking mgmt.)</td>
<td>- Joint venture site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service District for maintenance</td>
<td>- Public realm</td>
<td>- Install streets, curbs &amp; gutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish grid north of transit-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Granary Corridor connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of affluent sewer (district energy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Bid requires federal action to advance
  – under consideration now
• If advanced, moves to the Bureau of International Expos for consideration with others
  – decision made in late 2017
DISCUSSION
AGENDA ITEM: Recreation and Wellness Facilities Siting (Twin Cities Campus)

☐ Review  ☑ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Michael Berthelsen, Interim Vice President, University Services
             Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to review options for the siting of the Recreation and Wellness sports bubble and fields. The discussion will focus on the highlights of each site studied and present the administration's plan for siting the replacement Recreation and Wellness (RecWell) facilities. The administration will recommend affirming the siting of RecWell facilities on the Electric Steel Elevators site as proposed in the capital budget amendment approved by the Board in October 2016.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

At the October 2016 meeting, the Board directed the administration to further research potential sites for the RecWell sports bubble and fields that will be displaced by the Intercollegiate Athletics Track and Field facility. Following extensive analysis, a report is included in the docket that provides detail on seven sites studied. Each site has specific attributes that make it more or less desirable for RecWell programming, student access, Intercollegiate Athletics use, and/or financial impact.

The report includes cost components for each site, with specific estimates where possible and ranges where sufficient data are not available to make a reliable estimate. While financing and location are normally approved together, given the special circumstances and results of the report, the administration is now seeking Board affirmation of the original proposed location.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends the Board affirm the proposed siting of the replacement Recreation and Wellness Facilities.
RECREATION AND WELLNESS BUBBLE AND FIELDS
RELOCATION FOR TRACK AND FIELD FACILITY

PRINCIPLES AND OPTIONS

History of the Rec Sports Bubble
The multi-use fields and the bubble that provides weather protected use from mid-October through mid-April, were funded from student fees and constructed in 2011 to provide dedicated recreational and wellness-serving space for students. The ability to provide dedicated outdoor fields to students, and the ability to have flexibility in scheduling these fields, is significant to carrying out the mission of University Recreation and Wellness (RecWell.) These fields receive a high utilization by Kinesiology classes, intramural sports, sports clubs, rentals, and open recreation, with the bubble extending use during the colder months (mid-October to mid-April.) On average, 35,000 students use the facility when the bubble is up – primarily from 6 am to 11 pm daily. The field enclosed by the bubble was sized (360’ by 267’) to accommodate the needs of a variety of sports including soccer, lacrosse, and dual flag football games. In addition to the bubble use, RecWell utilizes the field under the bubble and a contiguous softball field for the months the bubble is down (mid-April through mid-October) when another 35,000 students use the fields on a similar schedule from 6 am to 11 pm daily.

Assumptions
- NCAA competition-level Track and Field will be built on the current site of the RecWell bubble and fields once replacement facilities are operational
- Steel elevators will be torn down and RecWell fields will be built on their site (with or without the bubble) to replace access to sports fields for students
- Fields under the bubble or indoor will be turf due to intensity of use (durability, weather resilience, reduced maintenance cost); other fields could be grass to allow for other uses (temporary parking, winter ice rink)
- Track and Field facility will be complete for use in fall 2018 (subject to design and construction being allowed to proceed with sufficient time)

Principles Established to evaluate options
- RecWell should be held financially harmless in a like-for-like replacement
- Solution must provide equivalent programming capacity (hours, days, seasons) as the current solution funded by student fees
- Construction/relocation of the bubbled facility must be timed to accommodate seasonal use, without disruption to student access
- Site must be easily accessible by most undergraduate students via transit, bicycle, or vehicle with appropriate parking
- Bubble and fields may be considered “interim use” until a higher and better use of any individual site evolves

RecWell Advisory Board feedback
- Received comments from students, including those who were here before the current dome opened
- Field and dome are critical asset and benefit to the health and well being students
- Dome was constructed from student service fees for use of RecWell and must be replaced at no cost to students
• Field space is consistently in the lower 25% compared to Big Ten and NIRSA comparably-sized institutions
• Uninterrupted space must be available until completion of an equivalent or superior facility for dedicated recreational programming
• Location must be safe with adequate parking and transportation for students to and from the facility

Initial Assessment
• RecWell and Athletics schedules are incompatible with one another for the purpose of supporting program needs as they relate to these facilities, as both groups need access to fields during the same timeframes on a daily basis
• Options for enclosing TCF Bank Stadium or the Gibson/Nagurski outdoor fields with a bubble do not result in significant cost savings, limit program flexibility, and result in restricted ability to schedule due to programmatic needs of both parties

Locations Considered and Analysis
Given the amount of land required for a rec sports bubble and fields, potential spaces were limited. Several sites were considered, and each site’s analysis, cost components, and scheduling data are included here.
[A] Steel Elevators site
This option considered constructing the bubble and fields on land currently occupied with the steel and concrete elevators
- Enables like-for-like replacement of current facilities
- Proximity to transit and parking make this location more desirable than current site

Cost Components
- Demolition of existing bubble site / building $ 800,000
- Sitework (excavation, utilities, fields) $ 2,570,000
- Support Building (head house) $ 1,930,000
- Bubble foundations $ 605,000
- Bubble mechanical $ 55,000
- TOTAL $ 5,960,000 (about $6 million)

Expected Usage (Athletics uses fields from 1-3 pm at current location, completion of Athletes Village allows that time to be released back to RecWell)
[B] TCF Bank Stadium

This option considered erecting a bubble over the field after football season through early spring

- Current use is 78% of the time between 6 am and 11 pm, 7 days/week during fall by RecWell (kinesiology classes, intramural sports), Athletics (football practice, home games, and field maintenance), and the University Marching Band
- Current use is 58% during the same time period in spring
- Field could not accommodate the fall and spring sports programs currently housed at the bubble
- Enclosing the field during winter months (December-March) may be technically feasible, but would require the construction of a foundation/anchoring system for the bubble, modifications to or replacement of the bubble to fit a narrower field and temporary mechanical blowers as a heat source
- A new multi-sport field and softball field would still need to be constructed at another site to provide RecWell with fields for fall and spring sports programming
- Minor cost savings associated with this option would result from not rebuilding the bubble head house; all other costs still incurred
- Football games continue through November, field would not be available for RecWell until December
- Option eliminates ability to host outdoor hockey games (one month for assembly, event days, and disassembly is required) and the revenue associated with these rentals

Cost Components

- Demolition of existing bubble site / building $ 800,000
- Sitework (excavation, utilities, fields at ESE) $ 2,570,000
- Bubble foundations $ 605,000
- Bubble mechanical $ 55,000
- Bubble modifications, electrical, air lock, rec sports locker rooms, restrooms TBD
## Current Usage

### September through November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Kinesiology Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Field Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Football Program Special Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Marching Band Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>URW - Intramural Sports and Sports Club Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### March through May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Kinesiology Classes (begins April 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Field Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Football Program Special Teams (begins April 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Football Program Practices throughout August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[C] Gibson/Nagurski indoor field
This option considered sharing the indoor field

- Current use varies from 50%-64% between 6 am to 11 pm, 7 days/week during fall, winter, and spring by Athletics for practices, field maintenance, and other program needs for football, baseball, women’s soccer, women’s softball, and men’s and women’s track and field and golf
- Practice times are primarily between 6 am and 7 pm Monday through Friday
- Used on weekends for Gopher Youth camps during the winter and pregame baseball and softball in inclement weather during the spring
- The new indoor practice facility (included in the Athletes Village) will move indoor football practices there, with other Athletics programs expected to use the available time
- Current and future need by RecWell and Athletics for venues during the morning and afternoon hours does not provide sufficient scheduling time or flexibility for either program, both would need to consider late evenings or weekends in order to share this facility

Cost Components
- Demolition of existing bubble site / building $ 800,000
- Sitework (excavation, utilities, fields at ESE) $ 2,570,000
- Bubble foundations $ 605,000
- Bubble mechanical $ 55,000
- Bubble modifications, electrical, air lock, rec sports locker rooms, restrooms TBD
## Expected Usage upon completion of Athletes Village

### Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Strength & Conditioning**: 6 - 8:30
- **Women’s Softball**: 8 - 11
- **Golf**: 11 - 1
- **Track & Field**: 1 - 3
- **Baseball**: 3 - 5
- **Marching Band**
- **Women’s Soccer**: 5 - 7

### Winter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Women’s Softball**: 7 - 10
- **Golf**: 10 - 11
- **Track & Field**: 11 - 1
- **Baseball**: 1 - 3
- **Gopher Youths Camps**

### Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Women’s Soccer**: 8 - 10
- **Golf**: 10 - 12
- **Track & Field**: 12 - 2
- **Baseball / Softball**: 2 - 7

- **Pregame Baseball and Women’s Softball Holds for Inclement Weather**

### Summer

**Gopher Youth Sports Camps**
**[D] Gibson/Nagurski outdoor field**

This option considered erecting a bubble over the field after football season through spring

- Current use is primarily between 6 am and 6 pm, Monday through Friday during fall and spring by Athletics for practices, field maintenance, and other program needs
- As with the indoor field, shared use between Athletics and RecWell would require rescheduling practice/playing times to late evenings or weekends
- Field is not used from December through March
- Field is narrower than the existing bubble field (360’ x 267’), RecWell programs would need to adjust to a smaller field (a challenge especially for club sports that require a larger field)
- May be technically possible to enclose field with existing bubble, but no space for a head house

**Cost Components**

- Demolition of existing bubble site / building  $ 800,000
- Sitework (excavation, utilities, fields at ESE)  $ 2,570,000
- Bubble foundations  $ 605,000
- Bubble mechanical  $ 55,000
- Bubble modifications, electrical, air lock, rec sports locker rooms, restrooms  TBD

**Current Usage (August through December and March through June)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[E] Athletes Village indoor field
This option considered sharing the indoor field
- Field is sized for football (360’ x 160’) and not for other sports or RecWell needs (360’ x 267’)
- Projected use by Athletics does not allow for the scheduling needs of RecWell
- Proposed multi-sport addition for lineman practice is not sized for full field practices (90’ x 120’)

Expected Usage upon project completion

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Athletics Department Practices, Conditioning, Rehabilitation and Field Maintenance

Football Program Practice
[F] Parking Lot 37
This option considered relocating existing parking to construct the bubble and fields
- 96” regional sewer interceptor runs under this location, and may need to be accessed/excavated at any time
- Fields and existing bubble will fit lot 37
- Lot has 668 parking spaces used for daily and event parking, is the most affordable parking on the East Bank, and is the closest surface lot for event parking
- Assumption to replace parking spaces make cost of this location much higher than the cost to build on the steel elevator site (no design work has been done to quantify the cost)
- Replacement parking would be located at the steel elevators site

Cost Components
- All costs at elevators site $5,960,000
- Added cost to replace surface parking $7,000,000 approximate, based on recent project

Expected Usage (Athletics uses fields from 1-3 pm at current location, completion of Athletes Village allows that time to be released back to RecWell)
**[G] West Bank fields**

This option considered relocating existing recreation fields and constructing the bubble at this location

- 2+ softball fields are used primarily in late afternoon/evenings and weekends for softball in spring/summer and soccer in the fall
- Bubble only will fit on these fields
- Requires replacement of existing fields at steel elevators site

**Cost Components**

- All costs at elevators site $5,960,000
- Added cost to move existing playing fields $1,000,000
- **TOTAL** $6,960,000

**Expected Usage** *(Athletics uses fields from 1-3 pm at current location, completion of Athletes Village allows that time to be released back to RecWell)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Use, Rentals, Intramural Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intramural Sports, Sport Clubs, Open Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Track and Recreation Sports Bubble Project Schedule

**11/18/16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire Strip Between Matheson Property by REO</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOR Approval - Track &amp; Field (T&amp;F)/ Bubble Relocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Predesign Approval</td>
<td>Aug 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: CBA Review - Track / Bubble</td>
<td>Sep 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: CBA Approval - Track / Bubble</td>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demolition - ESE/ Mathisen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP &amp; Award for Design/Demo (Steel &amp; Concrete)</td>
<td>Sep 16 - Oct 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Mathisen (Concrete)</td>
<td>5 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo ESE (Steel)</td>
<td>4 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design/ Construction - Track &amp; Field (T&amp;F)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP &amp; Award for Design/ Build</td>
<td>Oct 16 - Nov 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design/ Design Development</td>
<td>6 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: SD Approval - Track</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: Notice to Proceed (GMP)</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>3 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion/ Occupancy</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design/ Construction - Recreation Sports Bubble (RSB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP &amp; Award for Design/ Build</td>
<td>Oct 16 - Nov 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Design Coordination for ESE/ Mathisen Demolition</td>
<td>3 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: Site Selection/ Re-Use (Review)</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: Site Selection/ Re-Use (Approval)</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design/ Design Development</td>
<td>3 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: SD Approval - Track</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR: Notice to Proceed (GMP)</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>2 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5 Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion/ Occupancy</td>
<td>1 Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Notes:**
  - Have to Apply Track Surface in Summer Months
  - Cannot Relocate Bubble/ Fields Until ESE/ Mathisen Demo
  - Cannot Build Track Until Bubble/ Field Constructed
  - Purchase by May 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Can Schedule All RecWell and Athletics Programs?</th>
<th>Cost vs. Option A</th>
<th>Access/Location for Students</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A] Elevator Site</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>same (is Option A)</td>
<td>Closer for more students, access to parking and transit (bus, rail, campus connector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B] TCF Field</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>More: - headhouse, + new bubble, = site &amp; demo cost</td>
<td>Closer for more students, access to parking and transit (bus, rail, campus connector)</td>
<td>Would need to create field on elevator site plus adjust football site for bubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C] Gibson Nagurski - indoor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Less: saves cost of headhouse, bubble foundation, mechanicals</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Would need to create field on elevator site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D] Gibson Nagurski - outdoor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>More: - headhouse, + new bubble, = site &amp; demo cost</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Would need to create field on elevator site plus adjust football site for bubble; no space for head house / mechanicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[E] New Indoor field facility</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Less: saves cost of headhouse, bubble foundation, mechanicals</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Would need to create field on elevator site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[F] Lot 37</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>More: cost to replace parking</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Would either build a deck over existing parking lot or pave surface at elevators site for (less desirable) parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[G] West Bank field</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>More: same costs on West Bank, plus added cost for new fields on elevator site</td>
<td>Further location from most students</td>
<td>Would need to replace existing softball fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM

To: Mike Berthelson, Interim Vice President, University Services,  
   Danita Brown Young, Vice Provost of Student Affairs

From: George M Brown, Assistant Vice Provost and Director of University Recreation and Wellness,  
       Matthew Peterson, University Recreation and Wellness Advisory Board Chair

Subject: University Recreation and Wellness Advisory Board (URWAB) Student Recreational Sports Field and Dome (SRSF/D) Statement

The URWAB held their monthly meeting on Monday, November 7, 2016. The primary topic of discussion involved the recent Board of Regents request for additional study of sites for the relocation of the SRSF/D. Please see the following documents reflective of this meeting and the comments received from the Board and guests. These documents include:

1. Position statement of the URWAB regarding the need for maintaining the SRSF/D as a part of the facility offerings of University Recreation and Wellness
2. Minutes of the November 7 meeting. Please note these minutes are pending formal approval at the December meeting
3. Additional comments received from students who participate and utilize the SRSF/D

Please let us know if there are any questions or need for additional information regarding this subject. Thank you for your consideration and support for the position statement of the URWAB.
It is the position of the University Recreation and Wellness Advisory Board that the continued existence of the Student Recreational Sports Field/Dome is an irreplaceable asset and benefit to the health and well being of our students, as well as the community. The Dome was constructed from student service fees for the exclusive use of student recreation and must be replaced at no additional cost to the students.

The Board feels strongly that although the construction of track and field facilities are essential to University operations, it does not outweigh the need for field space on a campus that is consistently in the lower 25% for field space compared to Big Ten and NIRSA comparably-sized institutions.

In the event of a relocation of the Dome, it is critical that the space is not interrupted until full completion of an identical or superior facility is turned over to University Recreation and Wellness for dedicated recreational programming. Additionally, an effort must be made to ensure a safe location with adequate parking and transportation for students to and from the new facility.
I. Call to Order
Chair Peterson called the meeting to order at 9:01am.
II. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
The October 17th, 2016 minutes were distributed and Chair Peterson gave the Board a few minutes to review them. Chair Peterson indicated a change to the past Minutes that Emma McGuire was listed under regrets; however, she should have been listed as Emma Mazour. Mr. Fred Clayton motioned to approve the Minutes and Mr. Ryan Warren seconded the motion. All were in favor and the Minutes were approved.

III. Introductions
Chair Peterson introduced himself as Chair, and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. All present parties introduced themselves.

IV. Dome Relocation Discussion
Chair Peterson revisited the Student Recreational Sports Field and Dome relocation issue from the October 17th, 2016 Board meeting. He indicated the need for a statement from the Board to convey its position to the Regents. Chair Peterson asked the Board to present their constituents’ concerns.

Ms. Prescott indicated that there is a variety of opinions from students. She affirmed that most of the students with whom she spoke said that the Dome would be a good use of space and that the proposed location would be preferred.

Ms. Hoffman informed the Board of the one credit Physical Activity Program classes that are offered by the School of Kinesiology. She added that alternatives to the Dome would negatively impact that programming.

Mr. Warren pointed to general concerns of his constituency, including the original funding for the Dome and timing of when the Dome would be relocated.

Mr. Clayton supported the Dome’s relocation to the proposed location. He added there was a concern over the Dome’s proximity to other Recreation and Wellness facilities.

Ms. McGuire educated the Board that many first year students have trouble finding the Dome in its current location. She declared that RHA’s main concern is the safety of its students while walking to and from the Dome.

Mr. Okita reported that his constituency is in favor of the Dome. He added that relocation is acceptable only if it is necessary.

Mr. Borowsky stated that his constituency does not often utilize the Dome. He voiced general support to do what is necessary to maintain the facility.

Chair Peterson read aloud the Panhellenic Council’s statement submitted by Ms. Mazour via Email. The statement advocated for the need for the Dome facility and acknowledged that the proposed location is the best option. The statement voiced that the destruction of historical artifacts should be considered in future decisions by the Regents.
Chair Peterson opened the conversation to all present guests.

Mr. Gotch explained that Men’s Club Rugby has recently utilized the Dome for winter practices. Since they began practicing in the winter, the Men’s Rugby’s performance has improved. The team went from not placing in the All Minnesota and All Saints tournaments to placing first and second, respectively. He attributed such success to increased practice time at the Dome during the winter months. He added that other teams in the area have used this facility for winter practices. This included St. Johns University, University of Minnesota-Duluth, St. Cloud State University, and the University of St. Thomas.

Mr. Sannerud commented that the Dome plays an important role in students’ activity, since it is the only place on campus to play soccer during the winter.

Ms. Jacobsen expressed the importance of the Dome to Women’s Club Rugby as they hopefully compete for a national championship this year. She explained that Women’s Rugby could not practice basic skills such as tackling in a gym. There are financial restrictions associated with off-campus practice facilities. Without the Dome, the team cannot practice. She acknowledged that Women’s Rugby is responsible for her closest friendships and fondest memories. Being an out of state student, her teammates are her support system away from her family. She reiterated that Women’s Rugby would be devastated by the loss of the Dome.

Ms. Miller spoke to the Women’s Club Lacrosse team’s utilization of the Dome. She stated that Lacrosse practices from November through the summer. She attributed the team’s success to their ability to practice in the Dome during the winter. She added that it necessary to be able to practice in the winter, since all opposing teams are able to practice during that time. She confirmed that the Fieldhouse facility is not ideal for effective practices. She reiterated the importance of the Dome for Lacrosse.

Mr. Rekstad discussed his experience at the Dome, including Men’s Club Ultimate and intramural sports. He attributed the success of Men’s Ultimate to the ability to utilize the Dome. He shifted to other groups that the Dome benefits, such as Greek Life. Mr. Rekstad emphasized that the current location of the Dome is better than the proposed location. He noted the three areas from which Dome users travel: Stadium Village, Dinkytown, and Como. Mr. Rekstad argued that the current location is centrally located in respect to those areas. He suggested relocating the Dome to the Fieldhouse location, so it would connect to the Recreation and Wellness Center. He offered that the proposed location would be acceptable if parking were made available. He recommended not moving the Dome.

Mr. Jenkins informed the Board of his student employment at the Dome. He confirmed the popularity of Friday and Saturday open recreation, especially with soccer players. He indicated that many of these players are international students. Mr. Jenkins spoke to the other events that the Dome hosts, including adult soccer and flag football leagues. He emphasized that the Dome was a necessary facility for the University of Minnesota.
Ms. Daley noted her participation on the Women’s Club Ultimate team. She pointed out that the Dome surface simulates competition better than any other current University facility. She added that winter practices were vital to Women’s Ultimate due to many major spring tournaments. She suggested that many club sport athletes use their sport to relieve the stresses associated with school.

Chair Peterson accepted that there was a consensus need for the Dome facility. He noted the usage research of the facility to support the need expressed. He questioned whether relocation was necessary.

Dr. Brown responded that the Regents have approved the demolition of the grain elevators. He predicted that the Track and Field facility will likely be constructed in the current Dome location. He continued that the Regents have turned the relocation of the Dome into a justification for the Dome, which surprised him. He reiterated, based on the concerns brought forth by the students, that losing that space would be detrimental to University Recreation and Wellness and its patrons.

Dr. Brown cited the research completed on alternatives to the proposed location. He affirmed that this research proved that it is not feasible to consolidate current recreational programs into already existing facilities. Due to usage statistics, it would not be possible to offer the same programming in an Athletics’ facility. Dr. Brown expressed his opinion that Recreation and Wellness needs its own facilities to establish its own identity. He stressed the need and consideration for parking and safety at the Dome location. He reported that Athletics and the President agree that Recreation and Wellness cannot be in a worse situation because of the anticipated relocation. He concluded that the Board was ready to make its statement.

V. Dome Relocation Statement
Chair Peterson asked that the Board begin a discussion regarding the need of the Dome. He added that language could be included regarding the proposed site if there were a consensus.

Mr. Clayton asked if Ms. Asfahl would talk through the timing of the project with the Board.

Ms. Asfahl detailed that construction of the new facility would begin in spring of 2017. According to her understanding, construction on the Track and Field facility would not begin until RecWell’s new facility was ready to use. She added that the Regents will vote in December.

Mr. Clayton questioned if a compromise could be made to construct the facility on that site but still leave one steel elevator standing.

Ms. Asfahl reported that there have been discussions regarding such a compromise.

Chair Peterson added that the Board’s statement could include a suggestion of preservation.
Ms. Hoffman inquired whether the preservation of the steel elevators was the determining factor.

Ms. Asfahl indicated there will likely be some type of preservation.

Mr. Okita asked if the University had already purchased the site.

Ms. Asfahl and Dr. Brown indicated that the University has.

Mr. Okita sought confirmation that construction of the Track facility would not begin until the new Dome was in use.

Ms. Asfahl confirmed that assumption.

Dr. Brown reported that the Athletic Director has announced that he would not move forward on construction of the Track facility until the Dome is relocated.

Mr. Warren advised that the Board must highlight that assumption in its statement to the Regents.

Chair Peterson acknowledged Mr. Warren’s concern. He requested confirmation that the Board was in favor of support for the Dome.

The Board was in favor.

Chair Peterson asked for clarification that the Board’s statement should include language insisting that the new Dome is constructed before current one is demolished.

Mr. Okita clarified that the transition to the new facility must be seamless. He voiced his concern that new Dome facility would not be ready in time for destruction of the current Dome.

Mr. Clayton pointed out that any delay demolishing the steel grain elevators could cause a similar delay in Dome construction. He added that such delays may cause tension between the Track and Field project and the RecWell project. He questioned when the Regents would make a decision.

Ms. Asfahl informed the Board that a lawsuit has been filed against the University in order to preserve the steel elevators. She noted that the lawsuit could affect the timeline of the Dome project.

Mr. Okita questioned whether the preservation group was concerned with the concrete elevators, in addition to the steel ones.

Mr. Borowsky confirmed that only the steel elevators were a concern.

Mr. Okita inquired whether the site hosted a museum in addition to the elevators.
Mr. Borowsky spoke to the dynamic of the surrounding neighborhood. He described the Prospect Park neighborhood as resenting the University for planning construction without consulting with them.

Mr. Okita referenced similar issues with Athletics’ soccer facility in St. Paul. He asked the level of invasiveness of new construction to Prospect Park. He emphasized the importance of the Dome designers’ attempt to preserve the elevators and appease all parties.

Ms. Asfahl confirmed that plot of land is narrow.

Mr. Okita regressed to request the conclusion of the Dome relocation research. He refuted the suggestion of replacing the Fieldhouse by citing the loss of a RecWell facility.

Chair Peterson confirmed that the proposed site is the only location in which RecWell would not be negatively impacted. He posed to the Board whether its statement should recommend the proposed site as the best location.

Mr. Warren expressed that the Board should focus the usage of and the need for the Dome facility, rather than the location. He added that the Board should inform the Regents that the University has dramatically less recreation space than peer institutions.

Mr. Okita established that the Board cannot choose the location, but it can advocate for the facility.

Chair Peterson clarified that the Board is allowed to support or not support the proposed location. He offered that the statement did not need to speak to the location.

Mr. Rekstad questioned whether RecWell would be worse off by replacing the Fieldhouse with the Dome.

Chair Peterson stated that replacing the Fieldhouse would decrease RecWell’s space.

Ms. Asfahl added that due to the usage statistics of the Fieldhouse and the Dome, it is implausible to condense those facilities’ programming into one space. She referenced Physical Activity Program courses and Track and Field’s presence in the Fieldhouse. She confirmed that the new Track and Field facility would not replace Athletics’ use of the Fieldhouse during the winter.

Mr. Okita acknowledged the importance of facility space for RecWell. He added that since the relocation would come at no cost to RecWell, the opportunity cannot be wasted. He shifted to note the students’ concerns with the proposed location, such as transportation and parking. He considered a partnership with Parking and Transportation to add a Campus Connector stop and parking nearby.
Ms. McGuire emphasized a concern with the proposed location and additional distance for students, especially during the winter.

Chair Peterson informed the Board of the light rail stop located in close proximity to the proposed location.

Mr. Okita added that a Campus Connector or Circulator stop could be added near the proposed site.

Mr. Rekstad noted that the Victory Lot could be an ideal spot for evening parking. He pointed out that the Campus Connector already has a stop nearby the proposed site. He proposed a Circulator stop be added for East Bank students.

Chair Peterson reiterated that the Board’s statement should include a strong endorsement for the Dome. It should insist that the new Dome be functioning before the current Dome is demolished and adequate parking and transportation should be made available.

Mr. Warren formed that the statement should note the University’s standing within the Big 10 with regard to recreational space.

Ms. Hoffman questioned whether the statement should include language regarding the students’ economic investment in the current Dome. She added that RecWell has devoted time and work to support the need for this facility and the wellbeing of students throughout the winter.

Dr. Brown briefed those who were absent from the October Board meeting. The current Dome facility construction costed $7.5 million in student services fees. He reiterated that all conversations have overwhelmingly stated that Dome programming would not be displaced by this project.

Mr. Warren agreed that the statement must include that the Dome is a student funded facility. He offered that there is a further need for more facility space other than the Dome.

Mr. Clayton urged that the Board provide the Dome usage date to the Regents.

Dr. Brown agreed. He informed the Board that each year, there are 35,000 visits when the Dome is inflated and 35,000 when it is deflated. He concluded that this space is a year round facility. Dr. Brown noted the University’s growing enrollment. He acknowledged the challenge of facility space in a landlocked, urban campus, but he contested that losing space is not an option.

Chair Peterson pointed out the strong need and support for the Dome. He indicated that Mr. Day was creating a Board statement on which to vote. He asked the Board to standby while the statement was completed.
Chair Peterson brought the group back by displaying the drafted statement on the projector. He read aloud the drafted statement to the Board.

Ms. Hoffman pointed out that the statement only addressed indoor field space. She requested it include outdoor space too.

Mr. Okita agreed that indoor field space was too specific. He added that the continued existence of the facility should be noted to make the reader aware that the facility exists already and it must be kept.

Dr. Brown reminded that there was no language detailing the funding of the current or new facility.

Mr. Okita advised that the statement include verbiage that indicates that the current facility was paid for by student fees.

Chair Peterson proposed adding the phrase “student-fee funded” in the first sentence.

Mr. Warren argued that the funding source should be its own sentence to highlight it as a separate point. He added that the statement should highlight the student groups and the number of students who utilize the facility.

Mr. Okita questioned the length and depth of the Board’s statement. He proposed speaking to the need of constructing an additional facility.

Mr. Warren ascertained that the statement should not assume that the Regents have any knowledge for the Dome facility.

Mr. Okita referenced the Regents knowledge of the use of Les Bolstad Golf Course.

Mr. Rekstad offered that the Dome be referred to as “an irreplaceable asset.” The statement should note that the facility promotes and health and wellbeing of its users.

Ms. McGuire suggested that the statement speak to the facility as the only space that many clubs can utilize during the winter. It is important that the Regents know that no alternatives are possible for these clubs.

Ms. Prescott commented that student safety should be addressed in the statement. She requested that safety be separated from parking, to ensure that the Regents understand that students’ safety with respect to the facilities location is important.

Mr. Clayton asked that the word ‘additional’ be inserted to the phrase ‘no cost to students.’

Mr. Day pointed out the redundancy of including cost to students twice in the statement.

Chair Peterson instructed Mr. Day to remove the second mention of cost.
Mr. Mikl informed the Board that the name of the facility is \textit{Student Recreational Sports Field and Dome}.

Chair Peterson responded that the name would be changed once the statement is complete.

Mr. Warren asked to include data regarding the University’s rank in the Big 10 with regard to recreational facility space.

Ms. Asfahl declared that she would confirm the statistic.

Chair Peterson posed the statement to the Board.

Mr. Warren questioned whether the Board would like additional time with the statement following the meeting.

Chair Peterson offered to Email the statement to the Board, but he warned that it would be difficult to vote on the statement or any changes before the statement would need to be submitted to the Regents.

Mr. Warren suggested a short timeline to be able to make changes to the statement.

Mr. Okita agreed that he wanted additional time with the statement. He proposed that the Board vote on the concept during the meeting, while maintaining the ability to make minor edits of the statement within the coming weeks.

Chair Peterson accepted the idea that the Board vote on the statement’s concept.

Mr. Okita motioned to vote on the statement. Mr. Clayton seconded. All members were in favor of approving the statement.

\textbf{VI. All Campus Elections}

Chair Peterson noted the two open All Campus seats on the Board. He nominated Mr. Palmer and Ms. Heemstra for those positions. He asked if any Board members had any nominations. He requested each candidate to speak to their interest of serving on the Board.

Mr. Palmer provided background information on his experience. He is a junior finance and accounting major. He started working for RecWell in January 2015 as a Dome Supervisor. He is currently serving as a Program Assistant to Rebecca Schaar in Facilities. He communicated his desire to be a voice for students on the Board. He added that this responsibility will provide him with important professional development.

Ms. Heemstra expressed her desire to gain leadership experience. She explained that serving on the Board would provide her such experience. She added that she is committed to making a difference at RecWell, citing her involvement as an employee.
for Facilities and Intramurals. As a member of the University rowing team, Ms. Heemstra communicated that she would be a unique voice for student athletes and recreational sports students.

Chair Peterson allowed Board members to ask the candidates questions.

No questions were asked.

Chair Peterson noted that there were two open spots and two candidates. He asked for a motion to admit both candidates onto the Board. Mr. Clayton motioned and Ms. Prescott seconded. All were in favor.

VII. Announcements
Chair Peterson announced that the Vice Chair seat was still vacant. He indicated that the seat must be student held. Any students who are interested may Email Chair Peterson for details.

VIII. Adjournment
Chair Peterson called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Warren motioned and Mr. Clayton seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:07am.
Sorry for the late reply. I believe that the dome adds to the student experience and is an essential part of campus life. I've played intramurals in the dome and had a flag football class in the dome. Since we live in Minnesota, it is important to have the dome due to the weather. It can be cold near the end of the intramural season, and it can be harmful to the students health. Also, without the dome, the university couldn't have a winter flag football course. Since I took that course, I strongly believe that it is important to have the winter course because it motivated students to get some exercise in the winter. I strongly believe that the dome needs to be a part of campus and it adds to experience!

--- Pranshu Parmar

When I joined the University of Minnesota community, there was not a single field available to play soccer during the whole academic year despite the fact there was a large group of students who wanted to play. We had to play in other facilities at the rec center during the cold weather months, such as some of the numerous basketball courts. Needless to say, we were not allowed to play most of these times, as those facilities were not designed for this purpose. When the SRS Dome facility opened its doors in 2012, this was the first time a facility was available to play during the winter and benefiting different sports. The SRS Dome facility enhanced my experience as a student and allowed me to connect with other members of the university community with similar interests as mine. I do believe having such facility recognizes the diversity of interests among students, staff, and faculty. Soccer is top of the list for most international students and scholars. In my personal experience as an international student, I felt truly welcome and part of the university community only after the SRS Dome facility opened its doors.

--- Rodrigo Lovaton Davila

The dome has provided an excellent facility for student recreation. I have made many friends playing intramural sports as well as decreased stress through physical exertion and team building. There are already a limited number of appropriate locations for a gathering of intramural sports. I have played sports in the dome, on the west bank softball fields, and in the field house. The dome is by far the best up kept facility and proves to be the best facility to compete in every year. It's difficult to see so much money spend on a select group of students (the D1 student athletes) while there is little to no immediate impact on student life. At this rate, I would not be surprised if academic facilities start to suffer due to the focus on collegiate sports. The dome is a great place to come together and bond with fellow students. The location is already slightly inconvenient. The relocation of the dome would most likely decrease student interest which will result in a decrease in student well being.

--- Alec Werning

As a current fifth year engineering graduate student at the University of Minnesota, I have thoroughly enjoyed my intramural experiences at the SRS Fields, both inside and outside of the dome. These fields, in conjunction with the IM staff, provide convenient, entertaining, and competitive experiences that get us graduate students out of our labs and into the light of day. The softball, flag football, and soccer leagues centered around the SRS fields facilitate graduate student involvement and interaction by offering convenient opportunities to play on a field a short walk away from work. From personal experience, I know that most graduate students will compete and play with their peers primarily due to the accessibility of these fields and these leagues; searching for leagues outside of the U, in conjunction with distance to other facilities, unfortunately provides barriers to entry that many grad students are unwilling to hurdle. In short, my five years of IM sports at the SRS fields and dome have provided me with convenient and much needed respite, and I hope that future graduate students at the U will continue to have the same opportunities and experiences that I have had.

--- Mark Sullivan
The sports dome has had a very big impact on my college career. I have played intramural ultimate frisbee every season I was able to in college and the only way I was able to play in winter was in the Sports Dome. I was super busy my my first few of college and unable to play club Ultimate Frisbee for the U of M, which is something I had always wanted to be able to do. My senior year I was finally able to try out for the team. I was lucky enough to make it. I believe that being able to play year round was a big reason I was able to make the team after not playing competitively for so many years. The sports dome was the only thing that made that possible. Playing was incredible, I was lucky enough to be a part of the first U of M team ever to win Nationals!! The sports dome is also where the club team practiced, it really is a great space for the club!! I don’t know what we would do without it.

The dome really is a place that brings student together. I am also a big fan of soccer. I have played my entire life. I got a chance to meet a bunch of other students at the U who are also really passionate about soccer because of the Dome. It is really the only space where students can play in the winter and I met several people who will be lifelong friends of mine in the sports dome facility. Of all the U of M facilities, I would say that the sports dome has had the biggest positive impact on my college career. I can’t imagine how different things would be without it.

---

Thomas Bakko

I do believe it is important to have a track on campus, and was disappointed when the old track was removed last year for new Athletics buildings. That being said, I also believe a dome with turf fields is extremely necessary. I have used the turf fields for intramurals, pick-up games with friends, and training sessions. I often wish there was more open recreation availability for the dome, as there always seems to be a club team practicing, intramurals taking place, or closed for an event. The options for activities—such as soccer, football, training— are limited for students in the winter months. We have the field house and Rec Well, but for someone looking to train and condition, having the dome is very important. However, I must reiterate, I believe having a track on campus is extremely important for both the student-athletes and students looking to exercise, but the turf domes get a lot of use, and I would be sad to see them disappear.

---

Connor Lewis

The dome has been a great, conveniently located spot for my roommates and I to go if in need of a study break or some competition. We have participated in tons of intramurals at the dome including flag football, soccer, and we are exploring the softball leagues. My roommates and I have also used the dome for classes. Our flag football PE course was educational and it was a great time! Moving this dome would take away the opportunity for students to take a study break, engage in team building sports, and learn through physical education courses.

---

Nick Hoyer

I hope this isn't too late. I wanted to send a few reasons why the dome is so important to my club.

1. The progress of this program is directly related to the availability of the dome for practices. It is the only facility that can accommodate the space needed for our field size. Before these fields, my club had to practice inside the Bierman gym or the fieldhouse. Both of these restrict practice options in a variety of ways, but most importantly is the lack of space, risk of injury, and dissimilarity to real ultimate play. I’ve heard stories from alumni about how terrible practicing on wood in the Bierman gym, which was the size of just 1 court. And included was how easy it was to twist ankles when cutting on wood or the rubber in the fieldhouse. Finally, without the dome, they were only able to practice with cleats maybe twice during the winter when they paid to rent a dome space out in Plymouth in the late night. Moving from this type
of practice to the structured time we have in the dome is no doubt the reason we brought home a regional championship two years ago, and a national championship last year.

2. We spend about just as much time in the dome as we do in class throughout the year. Beyond just practices, we use the open rec times to throw more, workout, or even just mess around playing mini games or other fun stuff to promote team bonding. This team is a family of friends that work hard the entire year. The dome is what allows us to do this from November to April. We would be hopeless without this space.

3. Practice space is already limited. Even with the big dome, it is still hard to get practice space that we desire. With all of the clubs, intramurals, and open rec, we are limited to some difficult times. Practicing from 10-12 pm the entire spring semester is less than ideal, but it is still 2 hours of worthwhile practice. Without the space the dome allows, we would lose a lot of time available to us for practices which, of course, would show in our clubs results.

Most important to me is keeping this club progressing. We can’t win championships without the dome.

-- Saurav Dubey

I woke up this morning to read the email regarding the decision on whether to remove the dome fields or not. First of all, it is shocking that this is even a discussion. The dome is home to many club sports, teams that are valuable to all of their members. I play for the men’s club soccer team, this is because there is no varsity team. Removing the dome, our home, will leave us with no place to play as we can not afford to play anywhere else.

I will also like to point out that most universities have recreational fields and domes. With a university as large as this one, it would be a shame to not have any soccer fields anywhere around campus. Soccer is a large sport, the largest in the world, it brings people of all cultures and backgrounds together. The dome is where we play, whether it is pickup games on Friday or practice on Tuesday, it has become part of our routine and a fun pastime for most of us.

Personally, I do not understand why another track field is needed, there are sufficient ones around campus. Whereas this is the only place to play soccer on both the east and west bank.

I strongly urge you to reconsider, the dome is extremely important to not only soccer players but also other club teams and students looking to play casually during the weekends. The dome brings us together, it is our home.

Thank you kindly,

-- Ali Baydoun

This email is concerning the student rec sports dome and the proposal to replace the dome with a track. I am a member of the UMN men’s rugby club and the sports dome is where my team and I practice twice a week.

The dome is of utmost importance to not only the rugby club, but also to many clubs and sports around the university. It allows the rugby team to have a spring season, which no other team in Minnesota is able to do. It is also the only practice space available to us that is accessible and fully functional. We as athletes appreciate the dome very, very much. Please do not take it away from us.

-- Quinn Williams
My name is Luka Pavlakis, I am a student here at the University of Minnesota. In addition to being a student, I am also a member of the club rugby team, as well as a member of intramural sports. There have recently been talks of removing the field so that a new track could be made-- I am here to say, please find somewhere else to put it! Having the dome as a rugby player provides us with a consistent, safe playing field that allows us to practice year round, as well as allows us to have a spring season, as the weather is not cooperative at that time of year. Having this field and dome also allows us as students to hold intramurals year round. Without the chance to run around and stay fit, we will become less healthy and therefore, worse students. I hope that all students involved in this decision are taken into account as it is made. I, as well as all users of the field, appreciate the continued support, and look forward to continue using the dome!

-- Luka Pavlakis

I am a senior here at the University of Minnesota and part of the Men’s club soccer team, and the Sports Dome/turf is something that is invaluable to me and so many others, especially in regards to many of our club sports as well as the average non-athlete student.

Growing up playing hundreds if not thousands of hours of soccer, without a doubt, one of things I hated most were the undercut grass fields. You see when the grass is long it becomes impossible to move the ball at a high level of play. Grass field complexes just don’t have the money to cut their grass to the likeness of a golf course. So during high school I would spend countless amounts of my own money just to play on our local college turf field.

Coming to the U I could not believe that they had a open turf field of their own. I was so incredibly grateful and happy. Being Minnesota, still being able to play during the winter was something that was not only great in letting me enjoy the sport I love the most, but extremely beneficial for my health as well. At one point a year ago I must have spent upwards of 10 hours there a week through the months of November to February.

Please consider coming to the Dome field during the middle of November or early December, during a Friday open recreation period at around 630pm. Looking you will see 100+ people of soccer players, lacrosse players, frisbee players, football players, rugby players, and yes even quiddich players, as well as many more. There is no true field facility available on east bank to non-athletes and in that regard we are so so grateful for the Dome/turf.

I would say I’m a “usual” at the domes open rec hours. When I see a new freshman during the fall playing there with me all they talk about how fantastic the turf field is. Just last week I saw a high school friend mine who is now a soccer academy coach bring a couple of his players to the dome to train. None U affiliated, they just came here because of how great the turf and the experience is.

As to why the Dome field is not mentioned while touring the U or mentioned extensively to potential matriculants, I have no idea at all. I was debating between going to the U for college or taking a very very large scholarship at Augsburg. I debated for quite some time as one should. Being completely honest I would have made my decision in heartbeat if I would have known about the Dome turf field, that is truly how important it has been to me over the last three and half years.

Truly some of my best friends at the university and my favorite memories have stemmed from playing so much at the the Dome/turf field throughout the academic years and I am so grateful for it.

-- John Koplin
Recreation and Wellness Facilities Siting

Board of Regents Facilities, Planning, and Operations Committee
December 8, 2016
Assumptions

• Competition-level Track and Field on current bubble/fields site
• Steel elevators will be torn down and fields built (with or without bubble)
• Fields under bubble or indoor will be turf; other fields could be grass
• Track and Field facility will be complete for use in fall 2018
Principles

- RecWell should be held financially harmless
- Solution must provide equivalent programming capacity
- Construction/relocation must be timed to accommodate seasonal use without disrupting to student access
- Site must be accessible by transit, bicycle, or vehicle
- Bubble and fields may be considered “interim use”
• $6 million
• Like-for-Like replacement
• Proximity to transit and parking
- Still requires fields at location A
- No bubble access until December
- Eliminates potential for winter events
• Still requires fields at location A
• Unable to schedule all programming for both RecWell and Athletics
- Still requires fields at location A
- Field is narrower than RecWell needs
- No bubble access until December
- Still requires fields at location A
- Field is narrower than RecWell needs
• Major infrastructure under site
• Significant expense to relocate parking
- Still requires fields at location A
- Only bubble will fit here
- Existing fields need to be relocated
AGENDA ITEM: Capital Budget Amendment: VFW Cancer Research Center and Masonic Memorial Building Relocations (Twin Cities Campus)

X Review  Review + Action  Action  Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President
Katharine Bonneson, Associate Vice President for Health Sciences Administration

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to review a proposed amendment to the FY 2017 Annual Capital Improvement Budget for the following project:

- Veterans of Foreign Wars Cancer Research Center/Masonic Memorial Building Relocations

A project data sheet is included in the docket materials and addresses the basis for request, project scope, cost estimate, funding, schedule, and includes a site map for this project.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Several Academic Health Center (AHC) departments and programs remain in the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Cancer Research Center and the Masonic Memorial Building. The opening of the Clinics and Surgery Center resulted in vacant space in other facilities that can be repurposed for the current occupants of VFW and Masonic. Once the critical research and clinical operations are relocated to renovated space, these two “do not invest” facilities can be demolished. This is in alignment with the University’s Building-by-Building Strategy and the 2016 AHC strategic facilities plan.

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The Senior Vice President for Finance & Operations recommends approval of an amendment to the FY 2017 Annual Capital Improvement Budget for the project listed below. The approval authorizes funding and directs the appropriate administrative officers to proceed with the completion of the design and construction for this project:

- Veterans of Foreign War Cancer Research Center/ Masonic Memorial Building Relocations - $13,533,000
Veterans of Foreign Wars Cancer Research Center / Masonic Memorial Building Relocations
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
Project No. 01-000-17-0309

1. Basis for Request:

There are several Academic Health Center departments and programs remaining in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Cancer Research Center (VFW) and the Masonic Memorial (MM) Building. These two buildings have been designated “do not invest” in the University’s Building-by-Building Strategy. The current occupants must be moved out of the existing buildings prior to demolition and relocated within the Academic Health Center to ensure that critical research and clinical operations can continue.

2. Scope of Project:

The project will renovate eight distinct sub-project areas in three building locations: Phillips Wangensteen Building (PWB), Moos Tower (Moos) and 717 Delaware (717) for office, laboratory and clinic use. The total combined project area is 40,300 sf. The following is a summary of each project area:

Sub-Project A: This project consists of 14,000 sf of minor office renovations in PWB, Floor 1, in unoccupied clinic space. The departments served will be Vascular Surgery, Radiation Oncology, and Gastroenterology. The majority of the existing clinic rooms and spaces will be utilized as is with finish upgrades and minor mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work.

Sub-Project B: This project will move a laboratory from the basement of MM to 7th floor PWB. It consists of 1,500 sf of minor finish upgrades and mechanical and electrical work to accommodate the relocated laboratory equipment.

Sub-Project C: This project consists of 2,800 sf of minor office renovations on 6th floor PWB for the Family Medicine Department. This VFW/MM Relocation project will fund the design portion of the project. The Health Sciences Education Center project will fund the construction.

Sub-Project D: This project will move a laboratory from the second floor of MM to 11th floor Moos. It consists of 1,200 sf of minor finish upgrades and mechanical and electrical work to accommodate the relocated laboratory equipment.

Sub-Project E: This project will move a laboratory from the second floor of MM to 14th floor Moos. It consists of 5,600 sf of major architectural upgrades, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work to provide four Class 10,000 / ISO 7 clean rooms, a gowning room, tissue culture rooms, and supplemental lab spaces. Minor office upgrades on the floor are also included.

Sub-Project F: This project consists moving a portion of the Masonic Clinical Research Unit to 2nd floor of 717. The 800 sf project will construct three new clinical patient rooms with beds and one adjacent toilet facility.
Sub-Project G: This project consists of moving the Lillehei Clinical Research Unit from MM to first floor PWB. The project includes major architectural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work to construct a hospital-based clinic, a waiting area, reception area, laboratory spaces, and clinic and patient support areas. The project area is 3,900 sf.

Sub-Project H: This project will construct a new overnight stay clinic on first floor PWB. The 10,500 sf facility includes major architectural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work to construct a hospital-based clinic with six patient rooms and adjacent toilet rooms, reception area, staff and researcher touch down spaces, small laboratory, and clinic support spaces.

3. Master Plan or Precinct/District Plan:
   The project is in compliance with the Twin Cities Campus Master Plan dated March 2009.

4. Environmental Issues:
   Identified abatement costs include anticipated mercury and asbestos-containing materials within the buildings. The project budget accounts for the remediation of these materials as currently identified.

5. Cost Estimate:
   Construction Cost $10,783,000
   Non Construction Cost 2,750,000
   Total Project Cost $13,533,000

6. Capital Funding:
   Health Sciences $1,000,000
   Medical School 1,000,000
   University Debt 11,533,000
   Total Capital Funding $13,533,000

7. Capital Budget Approvals:
   This project was included on the Under Consideration / Evaluation list in the 2016 Six-Year Plan, however, it was not included in the FY2017 Annual Capital Budget as the project scope and budget determination was still in process. Therefore, a Capital Budget Amendment is requested so the project may proceed.

8. Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost and Source of Revenue:
   It is anticipated that annual costs for all projects will be similar to current costs.
9. **Time Schedule:**

Proposed Design Completion for all projects  
Proposed Substantial Completion for all projects  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Design Completion</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Substantial Completion</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Project Team**

This project is a Design-Build Contract.

**Architect:** BWBR  
**Contractor:** MA Mortenson Construction

11. **Recommendation:**

The above described project scope of work, cost, funding, and schedule is appropriate:

[Signature]

Brooks Jackson, Medical School Dean and Vice President, Academic Health Sciences

[Signature]

Brian Burnett, Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations
VFW / Masonic Memorial Relocation Projects
Twin Cities Campus

Board of Regents Facilities, Planning, and Operations Committee
December 8, 2016
Capital Budget Amendment
Location Map

Moos Tower

Phillips-Wangensteen Building

VFW / Masonic Memorial
(HSEC project demolition)

↑ North

717 Delaware Building
Capital Budget Amendment

Project Rationale

• VFW and Masonic Memorial Building have been designated “do not invest”
• Current occupants of VFW and Masonic Memorial Cancer Research Center Buildings can be relocated within the Academic Health Center
• Ensures critical research and clinic activities can continue
Capital Budget Amendment

Project Description

- Phillips Wangensteen Building
  - 16,800 gsf of office space
  - 1,500 gsf of lab space
  - 14,400 gsf of clinic space
- 717 Delaware Street
  - 800 gsf of clinic space
- Malcolm Moos Tower
  - 6,800 gsf of lab space
Capital Budget Amendment

Project Description

• Cost Estimate
  – Construction $10,783,000
  – Non-construction 2,750,000
  Project Cost $13,533,000

• Capital Funding:
  – Health Sciences $1,000,000
  – Medical School 1,000,000
  – University Debt 11,533,000
  Total Approved Project Budget $13,533,000
Capital Budget Amendment
Project Description

• Anticipated Completion:
  – September 2017

• Estimated Annual Operating Costs:
  – No significant change

• Design / Build Contractor:
  – MA Mortenson Construction
  – BWBR Architects
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project A: PWB Floor 1 Offices

SCOPE OF WORK

- STAFF
- STAFF SUPPORT
- BUILDING SUPPORT
- LAB
- PUBLIC
- PATIENT/EXAM
- CLINIC SUPPORT
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project B: PWB Floor 7 Lab Renovation
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project C: PWB Floor 6 Offices

SCOPE OF WORK

- STAFF
- STAFF SUPPORT
- BUILDING SUPPORT
- LAB
- PUBLIC
- PATIENT/EXAM
- CLINIC SUPPORT
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project D: Moos Floor 11 Lab Renovation
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project E: Moos Floor 14 Lab Renovation

SCOPE OF WORK

- STAFF
- STAFF SUPPORT
- BUILDING SUPPORT
- LAB
- PUBLIC
- PATIENT/EXAM
- CLINIC SUPPORT
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project F: 717 Floor 2 Clinic Renovation

SCOPE OF WORK

[Diagram of floor plan with labels and details]
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project G: PWB Floor 1 Clinic Renovation
Capital Budget Amendment
Sub-Project H: PWB Floor 1 New Clinic
Facilities, Planning, & Operations  

December 8, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:  Information Items

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS:  Michael Berthelsen, Interim Vice President, University Services

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

This item provides information on the following:

Capital Planning and Project Management Semi-Annual Project Report

This report includes projects in process that have been approved in the annual capital improvement budget and for which the Regents are required to approve the schematic design. The report highlights progress performed and challenges encountered in delivering the project scope of work within the approved budget and schedule. The Capital Planning and Project Management Semi-Annual Project Report is presented in the summer and in the winter to provide performance information prior to the consideration of the annual capital improvement budget and the six-year capital plan.

Pioneer Hall / Superblock Interconnection

This memo provides an overview of progress to date regarding a September 2016 Board request to further study the feasibility and cost of providing climate-controlled interconnection between the four residence halls on the Superblock and the approved consolidated dining facilities. The memo outlines two options and their cost ranges, rate impacts, and next steps.
## Capital Planning & Project Management

### Semi-Annual Project Report

#### December 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Est. Design Completion</th>
<th>Est Sub Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects in Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Advanced Material Science Building, UMD</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>$43,000,000</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops Research Soils Testing Lab Remodel, UMTC</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Education Center, UMTC</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>$108,830,000</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Hall and Consolidated Superblock Dining Facility, UMTC</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>$103,500,000</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Recreation Sports Bubble, UMTC</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Projects in Construction**                                 |       |          |         |                        |                   |
| Athletes Village, UMTC                                       | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $166,000,000           | January 2018      |
| Bell Museum, UMTC                                            | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $64,225,000            | August 2017       |
| Combined Heat and Power Plant, UMTC                          | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $112,981,000           | February 2017     |
| John T. Tate Hall, UMTC                                      | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $92,500,000            | July 2017         |
| Veterinary Isolation Laboratories, UMTC                      | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $29,500,000            | December 2017     |

| **Recently Completed Projects**                               |       |          |         |                        |                   |
| Bee Discovery and Pollinator Center, Landscape Arboretum      | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $6,620,000             | June 2016         |
| Bee Research Laboratory, UMTC                                 | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $6,450,000             | July 2016         |
| Mechanical Lab Renovation, UMTC                               | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $5,045,000             | August 2016       |
| Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab, Willmar                       | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $8,529,000             | August 2016       |
| Residence Hall Dining Center Renovation, UMD                  | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $5,250,000             | August 2016       |
| Wellness Center, UMC                                          | ⬤     | ⬤        | ⬤       | $15,000,000            | June 2016         |

| Total Portfolio Budget:                                      | $789,230,000 |
| Projects from $1,000,000 - $5,000,000:                       | 1            |
| Projects from $5,000,000 - $20,000,000:                       | 7            |
| Projects over $20,000,000:                                   | 8            |
| Total Project Count:                                         | 16           |
### Projects in Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Advanced Material Science Building, UMD</td>
<td>Construction not funded in 2016 Bonding Bill and resubmitted for 2017 request. Schedule revised to reflect new construction start date.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops Research Soil Testing Lab Remodel, UMTC</td>
<td>Construction scheduled to begin in March 2017. Approved schematic design at the Regents October 2016 meeting.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Education Center, UMTC</td>
<td>Schematic Design is in progress. Construction not funded in 2016 Bonding Bill and resubmitted for 2017 request.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Hall Renovation and Consolidated Superblock Dining Facility, UMTC</td>
<td>Schematic Design is in progress. Original project approval planned in FY17 Annual Capital Budget, actual Regent approval September 2016. Due to late approval, schedule for completion will be a challenge.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECTS IN DESIGN (cont.)

Track and Recreation Sports Bubble, UMTC

**Description**
A new Track & Field facility at the Athletes Village site and relocation of the existing Recreation Sports Bubble and Softball Field, site to be determined, on the East Bank Campus.

**Status**
Schematic Design for the Track is in progress. Unable to proceed with Schematic Design for the Bubble until site selected and potential legal issue resolved. Approved Capital Budget Amendment at the Regents October 2016 meeting.

- Scope
- Schedule
- Budget

PROJECTS IN CONSTRUCTION

Athletes Village, UMTC

**Description**
A new 321,000 SF Athletes Village supporting excellence in academics and advance training practices as well as a hub for the entire Athletics department.

**Status**
Steel framing complete for the Center for Excellence. Concrete work in progress for Football Performance facility. Footings in progress for Indoor Football practice.

- Scope
- Schedule
- Budget

Bell Museum, UMTC

**Description**
A new museum and planetarium that will provide a center for research, education, and public engagement around Minnesota’s natural environments.

**Status**
Site grading, structural steel framing and concrete slabs are completed. Exterior sheathing, interior wall framing and hanging of mechanical ductwork is in progress.

- Scope
- Schedule
- Budget

Combined Heat and Power Plant, UMTC

**Description**
Installation of new combined heat and power equipment in the existing Old Main Utility Building that will reduce the University’s carbon footprint and provide the best long-term solution.

**Status**
Substantial completion delayed until February 2017 due to unforeseen building conditions, complexity of start up and commissioning of process equipment.

- Scope
- Schedule
- Budget
### John T. Tate Hall, UMTC

**Description**
Renovation of the existing facility and new construction, totaling 229,500 SF. Includes the rehabilitation of the exterior and new infrastructure to support the program.

**Status**
- Abatement, demolition, and structure are complete. Exterior envelope is in progress. Interior construction is underway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Veterinary Isolation Facility, UMTC

**Description**
Demolish and replace three existing facilities with a new 31,140 SF bio-containment facility to support the University’s growing infectious diseases research initiatives.

**Status**
- Concrete foundations and footings is complete. Structural steel installation work in progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### RECENTLY COMPLETED PROJECTS

#### Bee Discovery and Pollinator Center, Landscape Arboretum

**Description**
A new 6,700 SF facility and 4,500 SF outdoor space that will create year-round learning opportunities for children and adults to learn about the lives of bees.

**Status**
- Project completed on schedule and on budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Bee Research Laboratory, UMTC

**Description**
A 10,700 SF academic research laboratory located on the St. Paul campus for research work in bee health and biodiversity, training and outreach.

**Status**
- Project completed on schedule and on budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## RECENTLY COMPLETED PROJECTS (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Engineering Lab Renovations, UMTC</strong></td>
<td>Project completed on schedule and on budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of 30,000 SF on the 3rd and 4th floors of Mechanical Engineering for flexible research and teaching labs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab, Willmar**                | Project completed on schedule and on budget.|
| **Description**                                         |                                             |
| This project is 11,900 gross square feet which includes the renovation of the existing facility and an 8,235 square foot addition of laboratory and office space for avian flu testing. |                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Residence Hall Dining Center Renovation, UMD**         | Project completed on schedule and on budget.|
| **Description**                                        |                                             |
| Renovation of 18,632 SF of UMD’s Residence Hall Dining Center to update space and to better serve student needs. |                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Wellness Center, UMC**                                 | Project completed on schedule and on budget.|
| **Description**                                         |                                             |
| 36,700 SF Wellness Center facility with a two-court gymnasium, suspended running track, classroom, fitness/cardio areas, general locker rooms, and a multipurpose room for group exercise. |                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regents  
FROM: Mike Berthelsen, Interim Vice President - University Services  
DATE: November 21, 2016  
RE: Pioneer Hall / Superblock interconnection

I write to provide an update on options for weather-protected interconnection between Superblock residence halls related to consolidated dining at Pioneer Hall, as requested during the Board’s September 9 meeting. Staff have been working with design and engineering professionals to better understand what is possible, what limitations exist, and preliminary costs.

There are two solutions being investigated to achieve weather-protected interconnection (by way of a tunnel) for all students living on the Superblock, both of which create a linkage between Centennial and Pioneer Halls. Based on all available information, providing this interconnection would cost between $3.5 to $5.4 million. On the higher end of the estimate, adding $5.4 million to the project budget would result in an increase to room rates of 0.5% beyond what is already planned.

With this information in hand, I have directed staff in Capital Planning and Project Management to advance a tunnel solution into design. Once design is complete and firm numbers are in hand, the administration will make a recommendation regarding interconnection. If one of these options is deemed desirable, approval will be sought through either a capital budget amendment or the FY2018 annual capital budget.

As always, I am available for any further questions you have on this or any other topic.