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AGENDA ITEM: Schematic Design

☐ Review  ☒ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services
Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President, Capital Planning & Project Management
Trevor Ames, Dean, Veterinary Medicine

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

In accordance with the Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, review and approve Schematic Plans for the following project:

- Veterinary Isolation Facility Replacement (Twin Cities Campus)

The attached Project Data Sheet addresses the basis for request, project scope, cost estimate, funding, and schedule and includes a site map for this project. In support of a world-class university, this project advances University Progress Card: Maroon Measures by reducing the inventory of poor or critical space by 14,080 GSF.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This project will replace the existing Veterinary Isolation Facility with a new 31,140 square foot biocontainment facility on the St. Paul Campus. The new Veterinary Isolation Facility will support the research and control of infectious diseases that are shared between animals and humans. The project was approved as part of the Annual Capital Budget at the June 2015 Board of Regents meeting in the amount of $29,500,000.

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends approval of schematic design for the project listed below and of the appropriate administrative officers proceeding with the design and construction for this project:

- Veterinary Isolation Facility Replacement (Twin Cities Campus)
1. **Basis for Request:**

   The new Veterinary Isolation Facility will support a growing emphasis on infectious disease research at the University of Minnesota. The facility will aid in solving the State’s emerging infectious disease issues and protect the State’s and nation’s food supply. Creating a biocontainment facility will support research with large animals and pathogenic agents for the College of Veterinary Medicine.

   The existing Veterinary Isolation Laboratory buildings were built in 1958, do not meet biosafety standards, and limit the range of research the University is able to perform. The new Veterinary Isolation Facility will provide the infrastructure to allow the College of Veterinary Medicine to become a leader in infectious diseases research by attracting renowned faculty, securing more research grants, and facilitating collaborative research among departments. It will also support the University in its mission to protect the health of Minnesotans and livestock, create new diagnostic tests and surveillance systems, and develop new vaccines and treatments.

   In support of a world-class university, this project advances Board of Regents Progress Card: *Maroon Measures* by reducing the inventory of poor or critical space by 14,080 GSF.

2. **Scope of Project:**

   This project will demolish and replace the existing three Veterinary Isolation buildings with a new 31,140 square foot bio-containment facility on the St. Paul campus. The new facility will support the growing infectious diseases research initiatives, house ABLS-2 and ABSL-3 bio containment areas, and include small animal holding areas.

3. **Master Plan or Precinct/District Plan:**

   The project is in compliance with the Twin Cities Campus Master Plan dated 2009.

4. **Environmental Issues:**

   It is anticipated there will be asbestos abatement required during the demolition of the existing facilities. The soil borings did not indicate any contaminated soil on this site. The project budget accounts for asbestos abatement.

5. **Cost Estimate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$23,983,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Construction Cost</td>
<td>5,517,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Capital Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 State Appropriation</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Debt</td>
<td>$11,090,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Funding</td>
<td>$29,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Capital Budget Approvals:

This project was included in the FY2016 Capital Budget.

8. Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost and Source of Revenue:

It is estimated the average annual operating costs for this project is approximately $512,000.

9. Time Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Design Completion</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Construction Completion</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Alliiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
<td>Knutson Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Recommendation:

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

Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Richard Putzenreuter, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

Pamela Wheelock, Vice President for University Services
Veterinary Isolation Facility
St. Paul Campus

Site Location Map
Schematic Design
Location Map

Veterinary Isolation Facility

North
Schematic Design

Project Rationale

• Existing facilities are inadequate
  – Non-code compliant
  – Thermal limitations of the facilities
  – Research constrained by room size

• New facility supports:
  – Growing emphasis on infectious disease research
  – Collaborative research among University departments
  – Year-round research
Schematic Design
Project Description

• New 31,140 square foot facility
  – ABLS-2 and ABSL-3 bio containment areas
  – Holding rooms
  – Isolation rooms
  – Administrative and support areas
Schematic Design

Project Description

• Cost Estimate
  – Construction $24,410,000
  – Non-construction 5,090,000
  Total Project Cost $29,500,000

• Capital Funding
  – 2015 State Appropriation $18,000,000
  – University Debt 11,090,000
  – College of Veterinary Medicine 410,000
  Total Approved Project Budget $29,500,000
Schematic Design

Project Description

- Anticipated Completion
  - December 2017

- Estimated Annual Operating Costs
  - $512,000

- Carbon Footprint
  - New Facility 720 Metric Tons
  - Existing Facilities (525 Metric Tons)
  - Total Carbon Footprint 192 Metric Tons

- Architect
  - Alliiance

- Construction Manager at Risk
  - Knutson Construction
Schematic Design
First Floor Plan

Room Department Color Legend:
- ABSL-2 Large Animal Isolation
- ABSL-3 Suite
- Large Animal Isolation Support
- Small Animal Holding
- Office
- Building Support
Schematic Design
Building Exterior
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AGENDA ITEM:  Update on Joint Venture Activities (Twin Cities Campus)

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS:  Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services  
Richard Pfutzenreuter, Vice President, Finance  
Susan Carlson Weinberg, Director of Real Estate  
Monique MacKenzie, Director of Planning

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to update the committee on the activities of the University's joint venture with United Properties Investment LLC to redevelop jointly owned property on the 2400 block of University Avenue.

The 2407 University Investment LLC, a public-private joint venture, was created in December 2013 with two partners, United Properties Investment LLC and the University. The primary purpose of the joint venture was the purchase and future redevelopment of the properties at 2407 and 2425 University Avenue SE, Minneapolis, currently improved with a Days Hotel operated by the joint venture and the Tea House restaurant leased to and operated by a tenant.

Redevelopment planning for the property began soon after acquisition by the joint venture. Two University surface parking lots located immediately to the west and north of the joint venture property were included in the redevelopment planning. The result would be a redevelopment planning site of appropriately six acres bounded by the Green Line on the west and north, 25th Avenue SE on the east, and University Avenue SE on the south (see map included in docket).

2407 University Investment LLC aims to move forward the development of a project that is both market-sensitive and in alignment with the long-term vision of its partners. A national design firm, Gensler, was hired by the partnership to assist with redevelopment planning by conducting early stage planning and site feasibility studies. The scope was to understand market demand, phasing, and density options. Phase I resulted in a mixed-use development master plan and site feasibility study report, including market studies, site analysis, and suggested project vision. Future work on design and development for the site will advance Phase I concepts have been validated and tested by key market representatives. Validation work is poised to begin in early 2016.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The University completed the East Gateway District Plan in 2009. The plan guides growth in the northeastern sector of the Twin Cities campus through establishment of principles to ensure that projects will create a campus-like setting and a sense of place, and investments in streetscape and buildings were balanced to achieve this result. The plan called for primarily academic research and athletics activities. Mixed use development at high density (10-15 stories) was envisioned at the intersection of 23rd and University, adjacent to the Green Line station that was in design at the time. This development was expected to be a focal point of activity for the City and the campus given the future Green Line service and the potential for the Stadium Village area to become more vibrant over time.

The City of Minneapolis completed a station area plan in 2013. At the time, multiple student housing projects had been permitted or were in the development pipeline. The City’s approved plan supported the idea of high density development, mixed land uses, and investments in sidewalks and other public realm improvements. The University continued to view the 2400 block of University Avenue as an area of long-term interest to the institution. When the current Days Hotel and Tea House properties were offered for sale, the University attempted to purchase them in alignment with the district plan. Though the University was not successful in the purchase, United Properties (the successful bidder) and the University agreed to enter into a public/private partnership. Considering the parcel’s strategic location at the edge of the East Bank campus, such a partnership presented an opportunity to both advance the district plan and ensure the redevelopment served the University’s mission-related needs. With Board approval, the University entered into this joint venture to achieve its goals in this location.

In December 2013, the Board of Regents approved the following:

1. $1.96 million for a newly created, Minnesota-based limited liability company with two partners, United Properties Investment LLC as the majority partner with 51% interest, and the University of Minnesota as the minority partner with 49% interest, to purchase the property at 2407-2425 University Avenue SE, Minneapolis (Minneapolis property), operate the existing hotel on the Minneapolis property, and redevelop the Minneapolis property in the future.

2. A $8.75 million loan under a Secured Promissory Note to the joint venture entity to purchase the Minneapolis property. On December 31, 2013, 2407 University Investment LLC was created, and with the University loan funds, 2407 University Investment LLC purchased the Minneapolis property.
This map is intended to be used for planning purposes only and should not be relied upon where a survey is required.

Base Data: Real Estate Office MNDNR, MNDOT
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The East Gateway District of the Twin Cities campus is an area in significant transition. Historically an industrial railyard serving the vast grain storage and transport needs of the upper Midwest, the District has more recently been utilized by the University of Minnesota as a remote surface parking reservoir. Within the last decade, two new research facilities, the Lions Research Building/McGuire Translational Research Facility (Lions/McGuire Research Facility) and the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR), were constructed in the District, with a third research building, the Medical Bioscience Building (MBB), under construction at the time of this report. In addition to research functions in the East Gateway District, the new TCF Bank Stadium is under construction and will open in the fall of 2009. With this pace of new development, the District has become the most rapidly developing area of campus.

In 2008, authorization by the Minnesota State Legislature of bonding for the Biomedical Science Research Facilities Program has committed the University of Minnesota to the construction of four additional research buildings over the next five years. In addition, the Metropolitan Council has committed to the design and construction of the Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT) line to be completed in 2014, with a transit stop planned for the District.

Given this commitment and amount of construction, the East Gateway District will undergo an accelerated pace in its transformation. In short, it is the expectation of the UM East Gateway Project Executive Committee that “the whole fulcrum of the campus will change as a result of this development.”

The University of Minnesota and its Capital Planning and Project Management (CPPM) office decided that it was time to undertake a District Master Plan and design guidelines for the district to guide its future development in accordance with the mission, objectives, and principles of the university. This report is the end result of a seven-month planning effort that commenced in July of 2008 to achieve this goal.
PLANNING PROCESS

The CPPM chose a planning team to prepare this District Master Plan and to work collaboratively with the University of Minnesota (University), CPPM staff, and University stakeholders to establish the vision for the East Gateway District. The planning team worked with the CPPM and two committees set up for this planning effort: the Project Executive Committee, responsible for the project oversight, major recommendations, and final recommendation to the University president and Board of Regents; and the Project Steering Committee, responsible for review and comment on the technical content and coordination among University departments to support the plan. The planning team also met with several staff members of various University departments and City of Minneapolis staff to understand the wider planning parameters and objectives for the District.

PLANNING CHALLENGES

The academic, and particularly research needs of the University will continue to grow, yet the University is out of land for expansion. The East Gateway District adjacent to the east bank of the Twin Cities campus represents one of the last non-developed areas available for future campus growth. Therefore, future development of this area should promote a level of density that will use limited land resources wisely.

Along with density, the University should establish a campus type of environment, one in which it can share valuable resources and core technical functions, rather than prepare individual building sites. Developed in this model, the East Gateway District will build an identity as a complete environment with a high level of amenities to attract and recruit top researchers and adjacent private partners.

The East Gateway District is not immediately adjacent to the Academic Health Center, clinical uses, or other core science programs on the main campus. Functional proximity to these related uses will be critical to the District’s and program’s success. Development of the District must utilize multiple and creative ways to link its users to the main campus, and vice versa, including future transit, campus bus, pedestrian, and bicycle connections. This will also reduce reliance on driving, parking demand, and traffic on local roads.

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

Planning principles were established early in the planning process to guide the creation of the plan. The planning principles for the District are intended to:
1. Provide a supportive academic and research environment.
2. Create an image of architectural distinction, integrity, and brand.
3. Optimize the use of scarce land resources.
4. Maximize flexibility for future development.
5. Strengthen the multi-modal transportation system in the area.
6. Create an attractive, functional, and safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
7. Integrate into the existing campus and surrounding community.
8. Build a real sense of community and place for the District.
9. Create a cohesive, memorable system of public spaces.
10. Develop a District that is environmentally and operationally sustainable.

VISION FOR EAST GATEWAY DISTRICT

Develop the East Gateway District as a cohesive complex of research, support, and athletic facilities that has its own identity, but is integrated with the existing campus.

The vision for the East Gateway District is supported by three goals:
• Support the University’s goal to be one of the top three public research universities in the country.
• Sustain the vitality and excellence of Minnesota’s health research.
• Provide world class facilities and an environment that will attract and retain the top researchers, faculty, and staff in the biomedical sciences and health fields.

The realm of bioscience and biomedical research is constantly evolving. New areas of science and new technologies will emerge that will drive translational research. The structure of bio-research teams will become more interdisciplinary. These trends in turn will have an impact on the physical facilities and districts developed to support these activities—research, clinical, and teaching environments will become more integrated.

To support this research-intensive and collaborative environment, the vision for the East Gateway District is of a vibrant, dynamic, urban research campus, where teams can have access not only to the best facilities and equipment, but also to other researchers in the District, in the University, and in the larger research community.

Future buildings will be grouped into walkable neighborhoods or clusters supported by shared technology and common amenities, seminar spaces, and areas for both formal and informal interaction. The District will include a mix of support, retail, commercial, entertainment, and recreational uses. Light rail transit will conveniently link the District to the main campus and the Academic Health Center, along with a high quality, outdoor pedestrian environment.

DISTRICT MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations of the East Gateway District Master Plan address urban design and program themes, including:
• Gateways and identity.
• Land use and activity patterns.
• Development framework.
• Development density.
• Building massing.
• Architectural guidelines.
• Landscape and open space elements.
• Circulation, transit, and parking.
• Infrastructure concerns.

SUMMARY OF THE EAST GATEWAY DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

The District Master Plan proposes a mix of new research and academic facilities, core technical support functions, and new office and retail uses within the 54-acre District. Activity in the District will be supported with the development of the Central Corridor LRT line on 23rd Avenue, combining its transit stop with a new multi-modal parking garage and bus transit/transfer facility. A buildout calculation of future development estimated that the District would accommodate approximately 3 to 4 million gross square feet (gsf) of total new development, including 1.9 to 3.0 million gsf in new academic and research facilities. Additional parking garages and smaller surface lots will maintain 4,200 parking spaces in the area as parking support for new development and as shared parking reserve for game days at the football stadium and athletic venues.

The physical development pattern creates a dense, walkable urban research district, with buildings in the 4- to 7-story range. Development is proposed on both sides of 6th Street, taking advantage of the undeveloped land immediately north of the football stadium, bringing research facilities into the pedestrian environment surrounding the stadium and helping to activate the area on non-game days.

Two gateways are proposed for the District: one at the most visible corner of University Avenue and Huron Boulevard/23rd Avenue, and the second at the intersection of Oak and 6th Streets. The first is a prominent corner that will create a foreground to the stadium. The first phase research cluster at the intersection of 23rd Avenue and 6th Street will be visible and accessible from this gateway. The cluster of buildings will be served by a new bio-commons with shared retail, food service, support amenities, and seminar space to create a common area of interaction for the next three buildings developed in the District. As this area builds out, it will be served by the construction of the Stadium Village transit stop of the Central Corridor LRT, scheduled to be completed in the same time frame as the next three buildings funded by state legislation.

The gateway proposed at 6th and Oak Streets is the nucleus of a second research cluster and bio-commons, visible from University Avenue with a realignment of Oak Street at 6th Street. It is easily linked to the core campus and Academic Health Center by a proposed pedestrian walkway, the Science Walk, that will connect directly to the Scholars Walk at McNamara Alumni Center.

USE OF THE DISTRICT MASTER PLAN

The following District Master Plan report describes in more detail the existing conditions of the District, the organizational concept for the East Gateway District, and its District and architectural guidelines. It is the intent of this report to guide development of the East Gateway District according to the principles established for the plan. It is a flexible guide, describing a framework for development, general massing, building envelopes, open space relationships, and key pedestrian connections, but it does not address specific building footprints or architectural design. It can therefore be adaptable to future program changes and needs within its framework as the District builds out.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

• 54-acre District total
• Approximately 3-4 million gsf of new development
• Total includes 1.9-3 million gsf of new academic and research uses
• Uses future Stadium Village transit stop of the Central Corridor LRT on 23rd and University Avenues
• 300 employees currently within existing development; up to 700 new employees with Phase I development
23rd Avenue Corridor
Looking North to 6th Street
EXISTING CONDITIONS

INTRODUCTION
About This Section
This section describes the various influences, past and present, on the 2008 physical context of the East Gateway District. Topics in this section include the following:
- Historical Context
- Regional Context
- 2008-2009 District Inventory
- Buildings
- Vehicular Circulation
- Parking Capacity
- Utility Corridors

EAST GATEWAY DISTRICT
The East Gateway District has been slowly transforming from an industrial area to University-related uses for several decades. Rail lines and a few remaining silos at the edge of the University are evidence of the District’s recent past. The first use of this District by the University was as surface parking. As the last, large-scale, largely undeveloped land area on campus, it has become a primary location for the University’s expanding academic and research programs. The new TCF Bank Stadium and several research and office buildings in the District have begun the transformation of the East Gateway District into a more active academic quadrant of campus.

Located on the eastern edge of campus and facing University Avenue as well as high profile venues like Williams and Mariucci Arenas, the new District has to respond to a variety of surrounding land uses and the needs of a built campus identity.

The site has no major natural features and is relatively flat. Many of the past industrial structures have been removed in recent years to allow for redevelopment. As the site has a fairly intensive industrial past, many recently developed sites have been subject to remediation. This, along with a relatively high water table, likely limits below-grade construction.

Recent construction during the last decade includes Lions/McGuire Translational Research Facility and the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research (CMRR).

A TRANSITIONING DISTRICT
There are still signs of the District’s industrial roots in the midst of massive construction with the new stadium and research buildings.
HISTORICAL CONTEXT
For much of the 20th century, the East Gateway District was a heavy industrial railyard. This past is clearly depicted in the 1930s historic image on the opposite page. The last of the silos that existed in the District were demolished in early 2008. However, just outside of the northeast edge of the District, a steel-framed silo of historic significance remains and will be preserved in one form or another.

Additionally, just west of Williams Arena is a historic fire station not owned by the University. This structure also falls outside of the study area on the west side of Oak Street.

As the campus has grown and the railyards have moved elsewhere, the land in the District has slowly been acquired by the University. Prior to the development of TCF Bank Stadium, the District was primarily used as a satellite parking zone. This can be seen in the aerial from 2006 shown below. The development of the stadium, new circulation system, and research buildings has dramatically transformed the District.

2006 CAMPUS AERIAL
Prior to recent stadium construction, the East Gateway District was the last vestige of inexpensive surface parking on the campus.

AERIAL VIEW OF CAMPUS, ca.1930
This historic image, courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society, depicts the extent of the railyards in the East Gateway District.
Research Relationships
As translational research has been identified as the primary focus for future academic buildings in the District, the site's relationship to other health-related resources on and around the campus is extremely important. The specific centers that are of programmatic significance to the District include the Academic Health Center, the planned Ambulatory Care Clinic, and biosciences in the academic core.

The distance from the East Gateway District to each of these centers is a significant challenge for future research collaboration. The plan will need to address pedestrian and transit connections to link the District to the other centers.

To the east of the site, the city has promoted research-focused development. The University hopes that this development will collaborate and partner with research in the East Gateway District, and is therefore a vital physical connection to create.

Connections
University and 23rd Avenues are the two primary vehicular connections to the campus from the larger region. However, in the long term, the planned Granary Road will also connect the site as a regional bypass.

Other vehicular connections to the main campus are limited due to the removal of through roads from the campus over time. Oak Street is the only remaining north/south connection from the campus to the East Gateway District.

In general, the District is dominated by vehicular traffic. Roads and parking lots still populate the site, and new roads have been constructed around the stadium to serve both its needs as well as the growing needs of new academic buildings.

The transitway that connects the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses ends at the edge of the new District; campus buses then go around the stadium to enter campus. The transitway to St. Paul is a permanent connection and is an asset to the new District and the neighborhood. Buses operated by Metro Transit also run close to the site, with stops along University and Washington Avenues.

The #16 bus, used by a large part of the University community, connects downtown St. Paul to downtown Minneapolis through the University's Minneapolis campus. Use of the Route #16 will be diminished by the planned Central Corridor LRT line, which should open in 2014. The planned closure of part of Washington Avenue to automobile traffic to allow for the future light rail will have a profound effect on the vehicular circulation patterns of the East Bank campus.

Pedestrian connections to campus are challenging from the East Gateway District. There are only minor sidewalks along very busy streets. Walking from the East Gateway District to almost anywhere on campus requires crossing at least one major thoroughfare. The closest major pedestrian corridor is Scholars Walk, which ends to the southwest of the McNamara Alumni Center.

Surrounding Land Uses
The industrial railyards to the north create an impermeable barrier on the edge of the District. The industrial buildings and silos that remain here connect the history of the East Gateway District to its history as an industrial center.

To the east along University Avenue, the urban fabric of Minneapolis picks up where the University leaves off. Small-scale retail shops, apartments, a hotel, a gas station, and many other buildings are mixed together to serve the needs of the University as well as the residents in the neighborhood. University Avenue is also the campus entrance from the east, giving the East Gateway District its name and subsequent responsibility to define the threshold of the Minneapolis campus. To the northeast, there are aging industrial and warehouse buildings, but private development has begun to plan for biomedical research facilities to complement the academic research programs in the East Gateway District.

The District’s southern edge is University Avenue and around the edge of the TCF Bank Stadium. This edge is perhaps the least tangible boundary, as both the scale of the stadium and the variety of buildings along Washington
Avenue obscure the transition between districts. University Office Plaza and the Information Technology building, both along University Avenue, help articulate this challenging transition.

To the west, Williams and Mariucci Arenas, along with the new football stadium, connect the District to the adjacent athletic area. The scale of these buildings, unique to their use and capacity, also presents a challenge.

2008-2009 DISTRICT INVENTORY
The following illustrations highlight the existing features of the East Gateway District related to buildings, vehicular circulation, parking, and utilities. These illustrations are intended to provide a baseline for recommendations made later in the report.

1 Medical Biosciences Building Under Construction
2 Lions/McGuire Translational Research Facility from 6th Street
3 Williams Arena
4 View from University and 23rd Avenues
5 TCF Bank Stadium Under Construction
6 Historic Steel Silos
7 Historic Fire Station
In addition to these buildings, there are a few other privately-owned buildings in the District. These are primarily located on the eastern edge of the study area and include a residential complex and several small industrial buildings.
2008-2009 Vehicular Circulation

This diagram illustrates the function of the road corridors in the District. University Avenue is a major regional connector and defines the southern boundary of the District. Oak Street and 23rd Avenue are the major north/south connectors into the District, and 6th Street is the primary east/west connector within the District.
Currently providing the majority of the surface parking for the campus, the East Gateway District’s future parking strategy directly affects the overall campus’s parking capacity. As future development comes on line in the District, structured parking will be a necessity to meet the needs of the District as well as the overall campus.
2008-2009 UTILITY CORRIDORS

A survey of major and medium importance utilities is provided here for reference. Utilities are and will be changing on a regular basis. Therefore, recent survey information should be referenced when planning and designing new facilities.
INTRODUCTION
This section describes the plan’s overall organizational structure. Topics in this section include the following:

- Organizational Concept
- Land Use Zones
- Research/Academic Zone

Overview
Early in the planning process, the organizational concept was developed to help guide the physical organization of the District. It divides the District into two major edges—academic/research and stadium—and designates where major gateways into the District should occur.

Based on this simple diagram, the District is subdivided into six land use zones. Each zone’s intended focus and primary use is described in this section, with most of the attention given to the academic/research zone, which is the focus of this effort.

Within the academic/research zone, there are three research clusters and one lab support cluster planned. Each cluster will include research facilities that share a research commons facility. This common space will function as a social and research hub and will include amenities such as cafes and dining. Additionally, shared research facilities will be located in the commons to reduce duplication and encourage collaboration.

TCF BANK STADIUM
Opening for the 2009 season, the stadium will be the most dominant feature of the East Gateway District.
ORGANIZATIONAL CONCEPT

The organizational concept for the East Gateway District grew from two basic planning challenges. First, the research focus of the District must find a way of working with the new TCF Bank Stadium to create a larger image for the entire University. Second, as the Minneapolis campus builds its eastern edge, the symbolic “gateway” role of the District as a campus threshold can be realized.

As the most dominant and identifiable feature of the East Gateway District, TCF Bank Stadium is the major organizing element of the District. Using the stadium as an anchor, the District is divided diagonally from the intersection of Huron Boulevard and University Avenue to the intersection of 6th and Oak Streets (reference the graphic on the following page). This division designates the southwest edge (in green) as the area “owned” by the stadium. This allows the stadium to continue to have a dominant image befitting its identity and presence.

With prominent stadium frontage on University Avenue, the northeast edge will be the primary research and academic focus of the District, and 6th Street and 23rd Avenue will become the primary vehicular and pedestrian routes for the future academic area.

Where each of the arcs meet are opportunities for gateways—formal entrances to the area. The larger of these, at the intersection of Huron Boulevard, 23rd Avenue, and University Avenue, is a true gateway to the University itself. The development of this intersection is crucial to welcoming traffic to the formal University campus.

The second gateway at the intersection of 6th and Oak Streets is visible from University Avenue and the campus, and has the potential to become the primary gateway for the research and academic functions of the District, both for the campus to the south and Dinkytown to the west. Although the stadium’s presence dominates the southern edge, the gateway at 6th and Oak Streets has the opportunity to create a visual identity for the District and connect it to the existing campus fabric.
LAND USE ZONES

Introduction
The land use diagram on the facing page and accompanying text describes the primary uses of each zone in the District, with the understanding that mixing uses within the District itself is encouraged. Other uses, such as small-scale retail, restaurants, library, or recreation can be considered for each zone if they support the primary focus of the zone itself. Cafes and restaurants in the East Gateway District will provide amenities for students and faculty, as well as the surrounding athletic venues.

Research/Academic
The research/academic zone is the driver and primary focus of this planning effort. In general, this District is intended to focus on biomedical and translational research facilities and will include parking and support facilities for these activities.

Stadium
Driving the organizational concept, the stadium zone is intended to support the stadium building and its users, provide prominent frontage on University Avenue, and allow space for game day functions to occur. The long-range development for this area will be nearly complete when the stadium is finished later in 2009. There will be no future building on this site, and continued development should work in service to the stadium’s prominence and the needs of campus visitors for athletic events.

Intermodal/Mixed Use
With the impending construction of the Central Corridor LRT line through the District, an opportunity exists for both a transit hub to handle the traffic and a way to interface with the existing mixed use along University Avenue. While specific requirements are likely to shift, the current facility is being planned to include a light rail platform, a major parking structure, a bus transfer station for University and Metro Transit buses, and associated rider services like newspaper and coffee stands.

This plan assumes that the platform is located parallel to 23rd Avenue, between University Avenue and the existing transitway to the St. Paul campus. The other elements will be housed in a large, multi-level facility to the northeast of the platform. The mixed use component of the zone is envisioned in a future linear building that parallels the platform and terminates at University Avenue. This facility will help define the intersection and the entrance to the University itself. Specific uses will be determined later, but could include ground floor retail with offices and residential space above.
Non-Research Academic
Recently acquired by the University, this zone is an ideal location for support services for the stadium, the District, and the overall campus. The only related facility in this zone is the MAST Laboratory, used by the Civil Engineering Department. Currently, plans are underway to locate land care facilities to the eastern edge of this zone. The remainder of the site, just west of the MAST Laboratory, is intended to serve support functions as needs are better defined over time. Structures built here should reflect the urban and industrial nature of the location and the site, as well as the zone's identity as part of the University.

Commercial/Mixed Use and Research Related
These two zones reflect the long-range planning vision of the city as outlined in the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI)/Bridal Veil Refined Master Plan (SEMI Master Plan), May 2001. This area falls into the South Redevelopment Area, which is defined by the plan to have a balance of uses, including light industrial, office, research, medium- to high-density residential, and limited retail/service areas. Additionally, the plan calls for "relatively dense" development of 3- to 5-story buildings. While the University does not control either of these zones, they are included here in order to plan for a successful physical transition between University functions and private development.

Consistent with the SEMI Master Plan, the research related zone is expected to develop into research-oriented facilities. The University hopes to build partnerships with private research groups that wish to be adjacent to biomedical and translational research facilities. Alternatively, other campus research functions that would benefit from co-location to the biomedical facilities would be established in this area. Future access to road and regional transit will support job growth and economic development in the region. These partnerships could allow for the sharing of ideas and resources related to the benefit of both the private groups and the University.

Architecturally, this zone should be encouraged to visually complement the University's research facilities. Also consistent with the SEMI Master Plan, these zones should provide a mix of commercial and residential uses that support both the University and the larger region.
The 2001 SEMI Master Plan laid the foundation for the uses proposed for the private research and commercial/mixed use zones in the East Gateway District.
RESEARCH/ACADEMIC ZONE
Within the East Gateway District, a program-based organizational concept was developed to encourage interaction, provide support, and subdivide the District into three smaller research clusters. All research facilities are organized around a central space, called a research commons. The research commons acts as the nucleus for each cluster, providing elements of public and shared space amid substantial private or semi-private office and laboratory spaces. The existing space suggests that three clusters could exist in the District along with a smaller core lab support cluster.

Research/Academic Clusters
The west research cluster includes the Lions/McGuire Translational Research Facility. This cluster, when complete, will also be the first set of buildings when the District is accessed from the campus gateway at 6th and Oak Streets.

The east research cluster includes the MBB and is currently planned as the first phase of new development in the District. Specific challenges of this cluster will include creating a link to the planned intermodal transit station in the District, establishing a cohesive image of the East Gateway District, and creating a successful connection to the existing facilities in the District as well as the rest of the campus.

The southeast research cluster will likely be the last to develop. Of particular challenge in this cluster is the Thompson Center for Environmental Management. Use of the environmental management/waste facility is critical to activities that occur in the District, but the building’s orientation and functional traits do not contribute to the core-focused concept of building clusters. As the east and west clusters develop, the role of this third cluster and its relationship to the research related zone will become more clear.

Core Lab Support
The core lab support cluster includes the CMRR and the core support functions housed in the MBB, specifically its vivarium space. The design of the CMRR facility’s first expansion is currently being designed and is scheduled to be completed in 2010. The imaging functions in this facility will serve the larger District and University. Contingent on future land holding, the site may support one additional renovation/expansion in the future. The MBB has been designed with vivarium space within the building. While this vivarium space could be expanded, future programmed phases will need to evaluate the optimal locations for such facilities in proximity to future researchers. Vivaria facilities should not be located visible to primary street frontages.

Research Commons
In order to share expensive lab resources and provide non-proprietary space for University staff and researchers, research commons spaces
This diagram illustrates the relationships and connectivity between research clusters planned in the East Gateway District.
are planned for each research cluster. The first commons will be built with the east research cluster. Each commons is planned to be the center of activity for each cluster. Internally and externally, the research commons should be designed to represent the larger identity of the cluster. Architecturally, these are public beacons to the wider research community in a series of buildings that could otherwise appear closed and impenetrable.

Functionally, the research commons can serve two roles. First, they house shared research instrumentation and would typically be spread to each research building in the District. By centrally locating expensive equipment, facilities become more efficient to operate.

Building on the idea of bringing researchers together to a central location, the commons can serve a second function, that of a social hub and gathering space. University staff and students as well as researchers can access cafes and other amenities such as conferencing/seminar spaces.

The specific program for each research commons will be evaluated in the context of the research programs that are planned for adjacent buildings.

RESEARCH COMMONS CHARACTER
Research commons are intended to be social hubs and house shared research equipment for each research cluster in the District.
As part of the East Gateway District Study, the planning team considered the initial program for the four facilities funded by the state. These include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMRR Expansion</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Biomedical Building</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillehei Cardiovascular Research</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Disease/Neuroscience</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The planning team worked with the Project Steering Committee to validate the initial program for the four facilities. The planning team benchmarked the occupancy densities and proposed gsf per occupant against peer facilities and found the program to be within comparable ranges. The planning team also evaluated a range of percentages for net square feet to gsf, establishing a 55% building efficiency target for each facility.

The planning team and the Project Steering Committee then evaluated the percentage of dedicated space to shared space by space type typical for biomedical research buildings. This helped determine parameters for the amount of shared space that might be part of the proposed commons for each research cluster.

The planning team also compared the percentage of open labs, lab support areas, primary investigator offices, staff support space, interaction space, and conferencing space against peer research facilities, and tested a number of different lab footprints as part of the development of the framework plan for the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES OCCUPANCY DENSITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UM MRI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF @ .50 to .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF @ .55 to .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF/PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF/Occupant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF/Occupant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MRI is a core support lab*
### UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES ALLOCATION OF SPACES

#### “Typical” Project - Percent of Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Biomedical</th>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>25% to 30%</td>
<td>35% to 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Support</td>
<td>25% to 30%</td>
<td>15% to 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Office</td>
<td>15% to 20%</td>
<td>20% to 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dedicated Space</td>
<td>65% to 80%</td>
<td>70% to 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>4% to 6%</td>
<td>5% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivarium</td>
<td>4% to 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Facilities</td>
<td>7% to 10%</td>
<td>0% to 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Scientific Support</td>
<td>2% to 8%</td>
<td>2% to 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Support</td>
<td>2% to 3%</td>
<td>2% to 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1% to 2%</td>
<td>1% to 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shared Space</td>
<td>20% to 35%</td>
<td>10% to 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UM East Gateway District Potential Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Biomedical</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Support</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dedicated Space</td>
<td>75% to 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivarium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Scientific Support</td>
<td>2% to 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Support</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shared Space</td>
<td>25% to 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION
About This Section
This section describes the district level urban design framework that will guide future development. Topics in this section include:
- Development Area
- Development Framework
- Height and Density
- Transit Connections
- Vehicular Circulation and Service
- Pedestrian Connections
- Parking
- Landscape and Open Space
- Art Opportunities
- Utilities and Infrastructure

PLANNING PRINCIPLES
Development principles were established early in the planning process to guide the creation of the plan. The planning principles for the District are intended to:
1. Provide a supportive academic and research environment.
2. Create an image of architectural distinction, integrity, and brand.
3. Optimize the use of scarce land resources.
4. Maximize flexibility for future development.
5. Strengthen the multi-modal transportation system in the area.
6. Create an attractive, functional, and safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
7. Integrate into the existing campus and surrounding community.
8. Build a real sense of community and place for the District.
9. Create a cohesive, memorable system of public spaces.
10. Develop a District that is environmentally and operationally sustainable.

The urban framework provides a long-term view of the District at build out. In the short term, there are a select number of existing facilities that must be accommodated in the District Master Plan, that in the long term are re-envisioned in another location or configuration. They include the University Office Plaza office building on University Avenue at 23rd Avenue, and the Fay Thompson Center for Environmental Management on 23rd Avenue at 4th Street.

The landscape and pedestrian spine of Scholar’s Walk on campus mitigates the variety of scale and massing behind it.
The Development Area Plan (shown on the facing page) is a physical framework that establishes the desired character and relationship of built areas to open space and the public realm of the District. It defines the build-to lines along streets and right-of-ways in order to create a consistent street wall for future buildings. The framework also establishes key open space zones and pedestrian malls that subdivide the larger blocks into a more human scale pattern, and delineates the developable areas within the District.

This plan offers maximum flexibility for future building decisions, yet preserves the absolutely necessary components of the plan. The light green areas of the plan represent all of the land that is developable in the District.

The table on the left describes each non-buildable zone in terms of its flexibility to be modified, specific location, and recommended size. Because the District is within the larger urban street network, some of the descriptions defer to city-defined right-of-ways and setbacks. Most of the open space descriptions are flexible except for malls, which should be consistent throughout.

### RIGHT-OF-WAY AND OPEN SPACE CORRIDOR DESCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Oak, 6th to Granary</td>
<td>100’ Right-of-Way, No Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>21st, 6th to Granary</td>
<td>80’ Right-of-Way, No Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>23rd, University to Granary</td>
<td>90’ Right-of-Way, 10’ Setback on East Side of Road Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>25th, University to Granary</td>
<td>100’ Right-of-Way, No Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>6th, Oak to 25th</td>
<td>80’ Right-of-Way, 40’ Setback on North for Swale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Transitway</td>
<td>100’ Right-of-Way, Verify with Central Corridor Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>4th, 25th to 27th</td>
<td>Use City-Defined Right-of-Way, Approximately 80’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Use City-Defined Right-of-Way and Setback Encourage 15’-20’ Pedestrian Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>27th, University to Granary</td>
<td>Use City-Defined Right-of-Way and Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Granary</td>
<td>100’ Right-of-Way with 25’ Setback Will Need to be Refined During Granary Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Oak and 6th Plaza</td>
<td>Flexible Open Space to Define Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Courtyard West of Lions</td>
<td>Approximately 100’ x 200’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Courtyard North of Stadium</td>
<td>Approximately 130’ x 300’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Courtyard North of MBB</td>
<td>Approximately 100’ x 420’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Courtyard on Thompson Site</td>
<td>Approximately 120’ x 240’ (South of 6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Mall Between Lions &amp; CMRR</td>
<td>Minimum of 100’ Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Mall East of MBB</td>
<td>Minimum of 75’ Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Mall North of Thompson</td>
<td>Minimum of 75’ Wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Setback North of Intermodal</td>
<td>Minimum of 50’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT AREA

The Development Area Plan (shown on the facing page) is a physical framework that establishes the desired character and relationship of built areas to open space and the public realm of the District. It defines the build-to lines along streets and right-of-ways in order to create a consistent street wall for future buildings. The framework also establishes key open space zones and pedestrian malls that subdivide the larger blocks into a more human scale pattern, and delineates the developable areas within the District.

This plan offers maximum flexibility for future building decisions, yet preserves the absolutely necessary components of the plan. The light green areas of the plan represent all of the land that is developable in the District.

The table on the left describes each non-buildable zone in terms of its flexibility to be modified, specific location, and recommended size. Because the District is within the larger urban street network, some of the descriptions defer to city-defined right-of-ways and setbacks. Most of the open space descriptions are flexible except for malls, which should be consistent throughout.
The Development Framework Plan on the facing page combines the Development Area Plan from page 41 with some assumptions of how buildings could be organized in the District. The building zones, coded by primary use, are laid out using typical dimensions for each use type. Research and commons building zones are all 100 feet wide, which could be wider or narrower depending on the specific lab configuration.

The table on the left lists each building zone, defines the base gsf, and provides a low and high range for the number of floors and subsequent total gsf. This table is provided as a range of potential development and gives some indication as to the potential height the building could achieve. The actual gsf per building will vary depending on number of floors, configuration of the base floor, existence of a lower level, and whether penthouse space is provided or not.

The phase one area of development is identified by the block defined by 6th Street north to the future Granary Road extension, and from 21st Street to 23rd Avenue.
HEIGHT AND DENSITY

Using the table from page 42, an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) can be calculated for the District. Due to the non-typical building typologies of the entire District (i.e., stadium, intermodal station, etc.), the FAR was only calculated for the academic/research zone. This allows for a direct comparison to other research, clinical service, and academic districts.

The table to the right describes a high and low range of FAR that could be achieved in the zone based on the assumptions of height listed in the table on page 42. Since FAR is a function of density, the planned gsf of parking structures and existing facilities were also included in the calculation.

As a benchmarking exercise, the Northrop Mall and the AHC East Bank campus were analyzed to determine their FAR. These references allow for a better understanding of how the East Gateway District might look at a particular FAR. The analysis for each is summarized to the left. The low and high ranges proposed for the academic/research zone fall between the existing FAR of the Campus Mall and AHC East Bank campus.

Within the District, the plan recommends a building height minimum of 4 stories and a maximum of 7 stories. It is further recommended that the two gateway nodes have an increased height over the rest of the District, with buildings at 6th and Oak Streets recommended at 7 stories. This would result in an FAR range average of 1.7. Proposed mixed use buildings at the University Avenue/23rd Avenue intersection are recommended to reach 10 to 15 stories to create a true urban gateway and presence on Huron and University Avenues.

Overall, academic/research buildings between 4 and 7 stories will remain below the established height of the TCF Bank Stadium, as illustrated in the diagram below.
ACADEMIC/RESEARCH FLOOR AREA RATIO

**Low Range**
- Existing GSF (Lions/McGuire, MBB, & CMRR): 307,200
- New Academic/Research GSF: 1,907,000
  Includes Research/Academic and Research Addition SF
- Parking Structures GSF: 648,800
- Total GSF in Academic/Research Zone: 2,863,000
- Land Area of Zone: 43.8 (acres)
- Highlighted in Blue

**High Range**
- Existing GSF: 307,200
- New Academic/Research GSF: 3,134,000
  Includes Research/Academic and Research Addition SF
- Parking Structures GSF: 648,800
- Total GSF in Academic/Research Zone: 4,090,000
- Land Area of Zone: 43.8 (acres)
- Highlighted in Blue

**Low Range FAR**
- 1.5

**High Range FAR**
- 2.1

**Recommended FAR**
- 1.7
TRANSIT CONNECTIONS
A key principle of the District Master Plan is the development of an integrated transportation system emphasizing pedestrians and transit. Due to the East Gateway District’s distance from the academic core, transit will be critical to ensuring connectivity to other research components on campus.

The primary connection to the rest of the university will be the planned Central Corridor LRT line. The line is planned to make stops in the East Gateway District and at the academic core at Washington Avenue and Union Street. Additionally, the proposed intermodal station will have a bus transfer station on the first floor. From there, users can access local and regional bus systems.

In addition to these connections, maintaining a direct shuttle connection between the District and the Academic Health Center will also be beneficial.

LIGHT RAIL
The planned Central Corridor LRT line will play a major role in connecting the East Gateway District to the academic core of campus.

STADIUM VILLAGE STATION
This is the planned section of the Stadium Village platform with 23rd Avenue on the left of the diagram.
VEHICULAR CIRCULATION AND SERVICE

Much of the proposed road network was recently implemented to accommodate the TCF Bank Stadium, to be completed in 2009. This network constitutes a substantial investment in infrastructure; therefore, the plan works with it as much as possible. Having been planned to accommodate future academic activity in the District, the planning team feels that the road network will perform reasonably well without major upgrades.

The East Gateway District is defined to the south by University Avenue. Along with Huron Boulevard, from the south, they provide regional access to the District. When Granary Road is realized in its entirety, it will be a third regional connection. As it is planned, the District will be bordered on the north and south by major vehicular corridors. The only internal east/west connection in the District is 6th Street. Internally, the District will have several north/south connectors that complete the local road network and tie the major east/west corridors together, improving access and visibility into the District, particularly from the future Granary Road.

Road Improvements

Two road realignments are proposed in the District: Oak Street at 6th Street, and 23rd Avenue north of 6th Street. Oak Street was re-routed from its original alignment to improve its intersection with University Avenue and accommodate traffic movement for the new stadium. Plans to extend Oak Street north of 6th Street would take it immediately west of the Lions/McGuire Translational Research Facility. However, a major water main and storm line remains in the old alignment of Oak Street, requiring a permanent easement.

Keeping both the easement and the currently planned Oak Street extension would result in a narrow parcel of land between the two corridors, not suited for development. The District Master Plan therefore proposes a future realignment of Oak Street at 6th Street, utilizing the former right-of-way as the new road alignment. This will require a reconstruction of the intersection of 6th and Oak Streets. This move allows consolidation of buildable land west of the Lions/McGuire Translational Research Facility for a new research cluster and gateway site on the west edge of the District.

In order to create more prominent views to the research cluster on 23rd Avenue, the plan proposes a realignment of the road north of 6th Street to close the view from University Avenue. This will create more visibility and identity for the academic and research facilities at 6th Street and 23rd Avenue, rather than lead to open views of the railyards beyond.

A shift in the alignment of the bus transitway between 23rd and 25th Avenues is also proposed to accommodate future construction of a multi-modal parking structure and its exit ramps.
Road Function and Hierarchy
University Avenue and 4th Street are major roadways that operate as one-way pairs starting at Oak Street and University Avenue. These corridors carry significant volumes of through traffic for the city and District. Their right-of-ways will be maintained in the District Master Plan.

Granary Road
The future Granary Road extension is envisioned as a regional connector and parkway. It will border the District on its north side, and is expected to carry significant traffic when completed. For planning purposes, the vehicular network within the District has been planned with limited new intersections at Granary Road to Oak Street, and 21st, 23rd, and 25th Avenues. Service drives will generally not be allowed from the parkway.

Granary Road should be treated as a front door/address street for future development. The proposed right-of-way and setback on Granary Road will allow for an approximate 25-foot landscape buffer on the southern, University-owned side of the road. This will include sufficient space for a multipurpose trail on its south side, and depending on final road design and layout, a potential bike trail on its north edge.

6th Street
The only east-west connector that traverses the District is 6th Street. It is a multi-functional street, accommodating vehicular traffic, campus bus traffic, pedestrian movement, and stormwater management. Its proposed cross-section allows for a 40-foot setback from edge of curb to building façades, able to accommodate stormwater swales planned and constructed, with pedestrian walks on both sides of the swales. As the District is further built out, increased pedestrian traffic in the District across 6th Street may necessitate installation of additional pedestrian crosswalks.

Primary Connectors
Oak Street, 23rd Avenue, and 25th Avenue are the primary north/south routes. They will extend to Granary Road, providing direct connection from Granary Road to University Avenue. Their proposed cross-section includes approximately 24 feet for pedestrian walks and landscape zones between the curb and building façade.

Secondary Connectors
As Granary Road is completed, secondary streets at 21st and 27th Avenues are proposed from 6th Street to Granary Road to complete the street grid of the District and provide access to service drives and future parking decks.
**Service Drives**

Service drives for the District will be accessed off of Oak Street and 21st, 23rd, and 25th Avenues. Service access for facilities south of 6th Street is recommended off of the service corridor constructed around the stadium. Here, the service drive doubles as a major pedestrian route, particularly on game days, and must be designed and maintained to a higher level of quality. Where feasible, service functions and loading docks should be consolidated. They should be screened from public streets, adjacent pedestrian walks and courtyard spaces. In some cases, retrofitting existing loading docks with screening (walls or fencing) should occur as additions or renovations of buildings are undertaken. As future phases are programmed, combined loading docks into one central location to serve a grouping of buildings should be evaluated. As much as is feasible, service drives should incorporate pervious pavement to reduce run-off.

Design service corridors to provide efficient and consolidated access for loading and deliveries while creating a safe, attractive pedestrian environment. Service corridors must interact with open space elements (pedestrian malls) at a limited number of crossings. Design of corridors should manage speed, use pervious materials, and contain strategically placed signage and lighting. The design should offset other negative effects through planting and/or structures.

Service drives and corridors should be attractively designed and support pedestrians and vehicles.

The service drive on Walnut Street can provide a direct pedestrian connection from the main campus to the East Gateway District.

Walnut Street can be designed to accommodate both pedestrians and service access.

The character of Scholars Walk should be extended to the District along Walnut Street.
PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS

A rich network of pedestrian walks that connect District destinations to transit stops, parking, area retail, and the main campus is fundamental to promoting a sense of place and reduced reliance on the automobile. The District Master Plan delineates this network of primary and secondary pedestrian routes.

Primary and Secondary Routes

Primary routes reinforce the primary street corridors and paths of the District, on 6th Street, 23rd Avenue, Oak Street, and the proposed Science Walk, and the north/south malls and sidewalks that connect Granary Road into the District. Secondary routes are assumptions of future pedestrian movement, but less volume than primary routes. Primary routes may include wider walkways and paving, special wayfinding, and other site amenities.

Several primary pedestrian routes are proposed to break up the long blocks on 6th Street and 23rd Avenue. New mid-block crossings should be installed at these locations to slow traffic and provide a safer crossing. New, consistent mid-block crossing standards can be developed that will alert motorists to slow down and yield to pedestrians. One new pedestrian crossing signal may be warranted at the intersection of the proposed Science Walk and University Avenue. Further study should be conducted to determine if this can be a fully signalized intersection. The East Gateway District Master Plan includes conceptual recommendations for potential above-grade skyway connections, should future programming show demand for such facilities.

Skyway Guidelines

- Skyways in the District will transport:
  a) Research materials.
  b) Building occupants or visitors moving between research buildings.
- Skyways will not be built to connect the District to other campus venues or facilities.
- Skyways will connect buildings within research clusters when at-grade connections would disrupt open space elements or service corridors.
- Buildings will be designed to accommodate through-traffic circulation at the skyway level.
- Skyway connections should occur at a distance from intersections to allow for visibility and wayfinding at the street level.

Streetscape Character

Street cross-sections have been planned with enough distance between buildings and curb lines to allow room for sidewalks, a landscape zone at the curb, and a landscape zone at the building edge. The street edge landscape zone provides some buffer against traffic on the adjacent road. Street trees and tree pits could include a “green streets” design, using the planter area as a filter for local sidewalk run-off.
The landscape at the building edge provides interest along building façades without major entrances or active ground floor uses.

To activate and maintain a quality pedestrian realm, future buildings should include active uses and transparency at the ground level and at major building entries fronting 6th Street and 23rd Avenue. Street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, site furniture, and wayfinding should be incorporated into a unified streetscape design that creates a contemporary, unique identity for the District, while harmonizing with previous campus site furniture standards. Energy-efficient lighting sources, drought-tolerant plantings, and porous pavement should be used for all pedestrian routes.

**Science Walk Extension**

One of the main pedestrian connections from the East Gateway District to the main campus is proposed along the old alignment of Oak Street, from 6th Street to Walnut Street and Scholars Walk. This route is currently used and designed as a service road to access loading docks at the McNamara Alumni Center and the Recreation Center. The plan proposes a re-design of this visual and physical axis as a major pedestrian route and an extension of Scholars Walk into the District. The re-design should continue to accommodate occasional delivery trucks and access to the loading dock of the Recreation Center. The Scholars Walk extension will take advantage of this pedestrian route with interpretive graphics that tell the story of the research conducted by the University.
PARKING

In order to accommodate future development, surface parking lots will be replaced by structured parking in three locations: west of Oak Street off of 5th Street; a mid-District location east of 21st Avenue north of 6th Street; and the proposed multi-modal deck and transit stop on 23rd Avenue at 4th Street. Ramps will be distributed within a 3- to 5-minute walk of all facilities.

The current parking total is 3,082 spaces, all surface parking. Proposed parking is approximately 4,200 spaces, including up to 3,300 spaces in the three proposed decks. Smaller surface parking lots of 20 to 30 vehicles will be located throughout the District. A multipurpose space proposed at the southeast corner of the stadium has been included in the parking count. This area should be designed as a green, landscaped foreground to the TCF Bank Stadium, with pervious pavement, able to accommodate occasional parking and vendors/concessions on game days.

At the lower range density, the parking ratio of spaces to square feet (sf) of development is approximately 1/500 to 600. The ratio of parking to development will vary depending on building type. Guidelines of spaces/use follow (assumes no transit):

- Wet lab 1 space/700 sf
- Dry lab 1 space/500 sf
- Office 1 space/350 sf

Assuming a mode split in the future of 70/30 (70% use single occupancy vehicles; 30% walk or use transit, carpool, or bike), that would reduce the guidelines as follows:

- Wet lab 1 space/700 sf
- Dry lab 1 space/500 sf
- Office 1 space/350 sf

The long-term parking strategy for the East Gateway District will depend in large part on the nature of future uses and construction of the Central Corridor LRT line. The University should continue to encourage Transportation Demand Management strategies to curb demand for single occupancy vehicles and to promote transit ridership.

SRF Consultants conducted a parking analysis for the East Gateway District Master Plan based on future built conditions to year 2015, testing for the lower density target, and including construction of the Central Corridor LRT line. SRF Consultants assumed that a new 2-lane roadway and extension of 25th Avenue from University Avenue to Huron Boulevard will be constructed as well as a reconfiguration of the intersection of 25th Avenue and Huron Boulevard. They found that with these proposed improvements, future roads and intersections would be capable of handling three parking ramps at the proposed sizes.

Parking ramps will be a strong part of the visual character of the District and should be guided by the architectural design guidelines. Active ground floor uses should be planned for the front façade of decks adjacent to primary corridors and pedestrian routes.

Creative Parking Solutions

Consider mixed use parking structures, tucking convenience parking along service walks and incorporating green paving systems into parking lots.
The parking deck proposed at 5th and Oak Streets will need access to 5th Street without compromising the future building site fronting 5th Street.
LANDSCAPE AND OPEN SPACE

Early objectives for the East Gateway District emphasized the creation of a cohesive, memorable system of public spaces. To achieve this goal, the District Master Plan proposes an interconnected network of public and semi-public spaces to balance the proposed density of the District with a sense of physical order, openness, and human scale.

Just as the east bank of the Twin Cities campus is formed by a hierarchy of malls, quadrangles, courtyards, and streets, the open space proposed for the East Gateway District is shaped by a hierarchy of similar elements that include:

- Pedestrian malls.
- Courtyards.
- Gateways and plazas.
- Streets and the public realm.

**Pedestrian Malls**

At lengths of 700 to 800 feet, the current development pattern of over-scaled blocks and roadways designed to the automobile do not enhance the pedestrian experience. The creation of a smaller block pattern with a series of pedestrian malls every 300 to 400 feet will provide more connections through the District, breaking up the scale of the mega-blocks into a more human-scaled urban grid. These pedestrian malls are proposed as similar in scale and character to existing pedestrian routes and former streets on the main campus, such as Church Street north of Washington Avenue and Scholars Walk. Their landscape character will emphasize a linear pattern of movement, open sight lines, and an enhanced pedestrian environment with shade, landscape, lighting, site furniture, and public art.

Enclosed connections between buildings should occur above the first story level as skywalks when crossing pedestrian malls, to allow continuous north/south pedestrian movement. In limited circumstances, if above-grade connections are not feasible, at-grade connections between buildings could be considered only if recessed from the primary frontage of the façade, with transparency and doorways to allow visual access and pedestrian movement through the connection.

**Courtyards**

Courtyards support the social life and intellectual exchange of a campus. A blend of enclosure and openness, the proposed courtyards will make the District a place made of many smaller places—some more intimate; some more engaging. They are intended to provide informal outdoor space for the immediate building occupants, with visibility and accessibility to other District users. Their landscape character can range from informal, unscripted space to more formal, programmed, and unique environments. Courtyards should include a rich palette of landscape and pedestrian amenities, including outdoor seating, shade, lighting, and plantings for color and seasonal interest.
The Illustrative Plan conveys the intended scale and character of distinct open space and pedestrian connections.
Pedestrian malls provide important breaks within District blocks, adding open space, views, and pedestrian access throughout the District.

As linear elements, pedestrian malls should be clearly articulated with a lush landscape, canopy trees, pedestrian lighting and furnishings, and pervious pavement.
Gateways and Plazas
Two major spaces will anchor the East Gateway District—a major plaza at University Avenue and Huron Boulevard, and a new plaza on the corner of a realigned Oak Street at 6th Street. Both of these gateway plazas are intended as foreground open spaces allowing uninterrupted views to new research and mixed use facilities surrounding the space. New buildings should be oriented to the gateway plazas, with active building bases and major entrances opening onto the space.

The plaza proposed at Oak and 6th Streets serves as a foreground plaza for new research buildings and the Mariucci Arena. This space is envisioned as an urban plaza able to accommodate a high volume of foot traffic on event days. It should be designed with street trees, hardscape areas, lighting, site furnishings, special features such as water or civic art, and high quality materials and finishes. The plaza should easily connect both physically and visually to the proposed Science Walk.

Currently the landscaped berm that divides traffic on Washington Avenue, Huron Boulevard, and University Avenue is proposed as a gateway plaza and a highly urban space surrounded by taller, mixed use buildings, creating a true architectural gateway to the East Gateway District. Major building entries and active ground floor uses should be incorporated to enliven this plaza, with pedestrian amenities and an elegant urban landscape to mitigate the traffic and transit activity of this key corner.

Stadium Corner
Stadium Corner is the southeast corner of the stadium block, and is currently occupied by a university office building. In the long term, that building should be replaced with a multipurpose open space that can accommodate game day vendors and concessionaires, and the foot traffic arriving by the Central Corridor LRT line across 23rd Avenue. A flexible landscape zone within a grid of canopy trees will bring down the scale of the space and make it inviting for pedestrians on non-game days.

Streets and the Public Realm
Streets within the East Gateway District are the backbone of the pedestrian experience. The two primary corridors in the District are 23rd Avenue and 6th Street, which link the District to Stadium Village and the future transit center on 23rd Avenue, and to the athletic area and Dinkytown on 5th/6th Streets. The character of 23rd Avenue on the east side of the District has multiple purposes. It is both a part of the stadium block and part of the vehicular and pedestrian entry to the East Gateway District. With construction of the Central Corridor LRT transit stop and a proposed multi-modal parking deck and bus transit center, 23rd Avenue will also become a significant pedestrian corridor.

A series of vegetated swales in the 6th Street right-of-way will accommodate the District’s stormwater run-off. As the District builds out, more sophisticated models to capture and treat run-off should be incorporated that...
include porous pavement, seatwalls, and other linear elements. Pedestrian walks should be constructed on both sides of the bio-swales with connecting paths across to improve pedestrian access to future facilities.

Sustainable Landscape
Sustainable design methods for treating urban storm run-off can be incorporated into the open space network of the District as features within courtyards and pedestrian malls, and along the 6th Street corridor. Porous paving should be used for all pedestrian hardscape areas to encourage infiltration. Plant material of native and drought-tolerant species should be used throughout.

The University of Cincinnati provides an excellent example of an urban plaza and gateway to an athletic stadium.

The 6th Street rain gardens can include a more urban edge and refinement.

6th Street Cross-Section
ART OPPORTUNITIES
Public art will give identity, branding, and a memorable sense of place to the East Gateway District. It will provide interpretive opportunities to explain the research done within the District and its impact to the University, city, state, and country.

The District Master Plan proposes a number of locations for future public art installations as part of the open space network, organized in a hierarchy dependent on the scale and spatial relationship to their surroundings.

Gateway Scale Opportunities
Two gateway locations are identified: one at the Stadium Corner on University and 23rd Avenues, and the second at the intersection of Oak and 6th Streets. Public art in these locations will need to be monumental in scale, visible from a distance, and in proportion to the scale of its plaza space and adjacent buildings such as the stadium, arena, and future research buildings. It must be legible from many vantage points, yet engaging at a pedestrian scale.

District Scale Opportunities
Located at the terminus of major view corridors along the pedestrian malls, these spaces are scaled and situated in a smaller proportion of open space than gateway spaces; however, these locations often have the stadium as a backdrop. Public art at the District scale should be visible and accessible by many within the District.

Courtyard Scale Opportunities
Located within research courtyards, public art at this level is more intimate—legible at a more personal scale. It helps animate the courtyard experience within a cluster of buildings. It may also be viewed from many upper floor vantage points.

PUBLIC ART
Public art in the District should be scaled to its space and include interpretive elements.
UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE
Due to the integral nature of the infrastructure system compared with the rest of the campus, this plan does not include an exhaustive utility study. Rather, utility and infrastructure conditions were analyzed to determine potential modifications and challenges to implementing the District Master Plan.

Parallel to this study, the University is evaluating campus-wide infrastructure needs. This study along with future studies will be necessary to effectively implement an efficient and sustainable infrastructure network.

Utility Concerns
There were two medium and one major potential concern identified through this study. Each concern is identified in the diagram on the facing page and described in the adjacent table. While the footprints that create these points of concern are flexible, the plan suggests looking at the possibility of relocating these utilities when it is time to move forward with the specific facilities to allow optimal development.

Through the planning process, the one major area of concern was determined to be worth considering for relocation in the future because of the quality of space that would be created at the Oak and 6th Streets gateway. Additionally, the steam line in question may have to be upgraded to provide additional supply. Decisions about when to relocate utilities at the Oak and 6th gateway will be assessed based on financial and development opportunity parameters. This phase of development is anticipated to occur in the long term future.

Infrastructure Expansion
As noted on the plan on the facing page, the current electric and steam supply lines do not exist to 23rd Avenue. This poses a problem for the first phase of research buildings discussed later in this report. These utilities will need to be extended before opening any new research facilities east of where they currently end.

The Utility Master Plan, approved in 2009, suggests that a new power generation plant may be required by approximately 2020. This may include the acquisition of a 5- to 10-acre site northeast of campus.

Infrastructure Corridors
When infrastructure is expanded, it is extremely important that lines and tunnels be implemented outside of potential development zones. Open space corridors and roadways are ideal locations for utilities even if they result in slightly longer utility runs. The major area of concern identified in the plan was created because the line was built along the shortest path through a parking lot rather than the existing roadway.

FUTURE UTILITY MODIFICATIONS/ AREAS OF CONCERN
1. Proposed research facility is over a 12” water main. This is a medium impact.
2. Proposed research facility is over an electrical ductbank and a steam supply. The ductbank is a medium impact. The steam supply is a major impact.
3. Proposed research facility is over a 36” storm sewer. This is a medium impact.

UTILITY CORRIDORS
Major utilities should be kept to roads and open space corridors to preserve future building footprints.
The architecture of the East Gateway District will help define a new area of campus. The University hasn’t undertaken the planning, design, and construction of a district of this size and scale since the West Bank area was developed in the 1960s. The District buildings must work together as parts of the District and a part of campus, while still respecting the design intent and programmatic requirements of individual buildings.

**CAMPUS DISTRICT**

The Twin Cities campus is loosely organized into districts, each easily identified by name or landmark: Northrop Memorial Auditorium or Mariucci Arena, for example, identify not only the name of a place but also identify the campus areas they occupy. These identities define the district and provide a means of orientation. Each district is held together by elements common or unique to that district. These elements include commonalities related to location, use, formal order, or arrangement within a district, to more architectural commonalities such as age, massing, materials, geometry, fenestration, and level of ornamentation.

With a long history as the “back” of campus, the East Gateway District has a number of challenges to overcome to integrate fully into the University’s built fabric. These challenges represent a collective opportunity for architects and designers to fully connect the new district into a large and diverse campus.

**PHILOSOPHY**

The overarching philosophy of the architectural guidelines as a response to the challenges facing the District is threefold: first to unify the District as a place of biosciences research; second, to integrate the new District into the existing campus; and third, to identify the District as a research center at the University of Minnesota. The architectural guidelines work to be a descriptive impetus for design rather than prescribing definite rules or standards.

**EAST GATEWAY DISTRICT CHALLENGES**

1. **District at the Back/District at the Edge**

The addition of the TCF Bank Stadium and recent research buildings has begun to shift the perception of “back door” for this part of campus. The District’s location at the edge of campus, adjacent to athletic venues and close to active retail uses south of University Avenue, creates the opportunity for integrating the District more fully into the campus and urban fabric. The condition of “edge” therefore can become an opportunity for “gateway,” a type of new threshold into campus.

2. **Inconsistent Context**

The stadium and arenas have set one built example for the District. They are of one type and character—traditional, monumental, and brick. Recent research buildings of the District provide a second architectural context, with more glazing and articulation of massing and scale. Rail lines and historic silos are the sole remnants of the industrial history of the area, providing
a third context in the District. A design opportunity lies in incorporating each of these influences as parts of a broad whole, and an impetus for the design of contemporary science and research buildings.

3. **Stadium Dominates the District**
The new TCF Bank Stadium is large by almost any architectural standard. Its proximity to other athletic venues adds to the feeling that this area can only house buildings of a similar scale. New buildings should address the scale and materiality of the athletic venues, but must also mediate between their sheer size and the more human-scaled, contemporary environment of future research buildings.
ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT
Architecturally, the University’s campus is extraordinarily diverse. The variety of architectural styles embodies the past 150 years of American architectural history. Richardsonian Romanesque, PWA Moderne, International Style, New Brutalism, examples of the various historic revivals from the turn of the twentieth century, and the contemporary eclectic styles of the last twenty years are all represented on campus.

Lively neighborhoods have developed at the edges of campus, home to small-scale restaurants; retail establishments; and staff, faculty, and student housing. They are equally diverse in building size, age, and use. These neighborhoods are important to the vitality and definition of the campus.

The recent University master plan recognizes the eclectic nature of the campus and architectural styles over its evolution. However, the principles of the campus-wide master plan also strive for cohesiveness in the campus environment, through appropriate scale, common materiality, buildings that shape positive outdoor space, the treatment of primary entrances, etc. This does not imply that new construction should copy historic styles, but rather look to successful examples on campus that embody these principles and create memorable places.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES
1. Commons facilities within buildings form centers for multi-building development and interaction.
2. Commons facilities will be architecturally iconic to address their unique role in the District.
3. Lab buildings will have circulation corridors fronting Oak Street, 6th Street, and 23rd Avenue.
4. Offices, support spaces, and circulation elements will be separately articulated.
5. Major street walls will be predominantly masonry.
6. Bridges and walkways will be uniquely designed to complement adjacent buildings.
7. Building bases should feel open and use glazing as a dominant material and provide weather cover near doorways.
8. Ground level façades on Oak Street, 6th Street, and 23rd Avenue will have as much transparency and activity visible to the street as possible to animate the pedestrian environment.
9. An integrated landscape of terraces, water, and planting will accent building entrances.
10. Courtyards will be landscaped and accessible.
ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

Architectural Character

1. Use predominately brick, with limited areas of stone, metal, or other accent materials for building exteriors.
2. Provide a variety of heights, textures, and scales.
3. Construct buildings of not less than 3 stories nor more than 7 stories.
4. Use large glass walls to enhance entrances, important internal circulation events, and courtyards.
5. Connect buildings with interesting bridges and walkways.
6. Design and arrange internal and external space to support connectivity and collaboration.
7. Design commons facilities within buildings to be iconic through massing, materials, and lighting.
8. Accent building entrances with integrated landscape of terraces, water, and planting.
9. Achieve at least USGBC LEED® Gold certification for all buildings and landscapes.
Research Pragmatics

1. Use predominately modular open labs capable of adapting to future wet or dry programs.
2. Provide at least 15-foot floor height with a minimum 22-foot structural span throughout.
3. Locate adequate support spaces between labs and corridors.
4. Aggregate principal investigator offices around areas for casual interaction and collaboration.
5. Provide natural light to labs and offices.
Interaction

1. Develop a program model to achieve 55% efficiency to support casual collaborative spaces.
2. Provide artwork and display areas that describe scientific inquiry in formal public areas.
3. Locate small lounges, atria, staircases, seminar spaces, and conference rooms to foster interaction.
4. Provide a variety of soft seating, tables and chairs, and adjoining flexible storage space.
5. Locate interaction areas along the path of travel between labs, offices, and circulation corridors.
6. Zone multiple areas from formal to completely unscripted throughout.
7. Provide technology, white boards, coffee kitchens, a variety of soft seating, and tables and chairs.
8. Allow for display of various media illustrating current areas of inquiry.
Sustainability
1. Require all new buildings to attain USGBC LEED® Gold certification.
2. Continue to implement the East Gateway Stormwater Management strategy, including green roofs, bio-swales, and infiltration planters.
3. Develop traffic/transit plans to leverage the intermodal station and existing campus transit systems.
4. Similar to the existing Scholars Walk, create a Science Walk display that tells the story of the University’s commitment to the interrelated challenges of the biosciences and environmental sustainability.
The East Gateway District Master Plan is an extension of the Twin Cities Campus Master Plan, approved by the Board of Regents in March 2009.

The District Master Plan will be used to guide future development decisions and influence operations decisions in the District. Planning and design efforts will refer to the District Master Plan when projects are being defined, sites are selected, and in both pre-design and schematic design stages of development.

Project Development and Approvals

Specific objectives and strategies for capital projects affecting land use, buildings, open spaces, landscape, and infrastructure will be determined in consultation with the District Master Plan.

The ultimate responsibility for day-to-day administration of the District Master Plan is held by the Vice President of University Services. Projects will be reviewed at the pre-design and schematic design level of detail by Planning and Architecture staff, who will provide analysis and recommendations to the Biomedical Discovery District Executive Committee.

Phasing and Planning Horizon

Near-term activities, projected within 0-5 years, are expected to include:

1. Coordinated site planning, programming, and construction of biomedical research facilities in the area noted as Phase 1 on the following diagram by summer 2009.
2. Expanded additional energy capacity (steam and chilled water for heating and cooling) to support these buildings as buildout occurs. Distribution networks are planned for orderly expansion in this District coincident with the first phase of building construction.
3. Construction of a realigned segment of 23rd Avenue, north of 6th Street in the first phase of building development.
4. Commencement of stadium events in September 2009, consisting primarily of University of Minnesota football games and other athletic events.
5. Commencement of the Central Corridor LRT service by approximately 2014, operated and owned by Metropolitan Council.

Long-term activities, more than 5 years into the future, are expected to include:

1. Redevelopment of key sites for University-related use, including the Thompson Center for Environmental Management (501 23rd Avenue SE) and the 2221 University Office Plaza building (2221 University Avenue SE)
2. Development of two other parking/multi-modal facilities within the District, and sized to meet reductions in parking demand and increasing use of regional and on-campus transit.

Updates on project activities within the District may be found at the Capital Planning and Project Management website at http://www.cppm.umn.edu
Benefits of Project

- Advance University interests: academic, financial, outreach
- Demonstrate effective partnerships
- Improve the local area through targeted investment
Public Private Partnerships: Definition

A contractual agreement between UMN and a non-governmental entity to support a mission-related purpose or to support ongoing operations.

Differs from the purchase of goods and/or services or from privatization in that the University retains a defined role in all or some aspect of the following:

1) ownership
2) regulation
3) remediation on non-performance
Purpose of Partnerships

- Relates directly to the University’s mission, operations, or key strategic goals
- Designed to leverage the skills and assets of each party to deliver the service, activity, or facility
- Provide for an appropriate sharing of risk and rewards
- Protect the University’s legal, financial, and reputational risk including real or potential impacts to the University’s credit
- The University retains a defined role in all or some aspect of the following: 1) ownership, 2) regulation, or 3) remediation on non-performance
Partnership Structure

- History of Partnership
- Ownership
  - Jointly owned site: 51% United Properties, 49% University
  - Other sites: 100% University owned
- Participation in decision making: Governance
- Timeline
  - Joint Venture: near term (within five years), phasing
Land Control: 6.5 Acres
Site and Surroundings
Prospect North: Objectives

Investment and City Building
• Grayfield redevelopment
• Utility and street planning, design, and construction
• Placemaking
• Taxable land base
Prospect North: Opportunities/Challenges

• Relative to University mission
• Gateway to campus
• Real estate opportunity
• Transportation service
• Utility build-out
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC REALM</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>DISTRICT SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKS &amp; PLAZAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIXED USE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISTRICT ENERGY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create attractive, lively public</td>
<td>Create a mixed-use district</td>
<td>Provide district heating and cooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm including signature parks and</td>
<td>including housing, commercial,</td>
<td>systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plazas such as Triangle Park</td>
<td>education, entertainment, civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Green 4th Street</td>
<td>functions, business and research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREETS AND MOBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design a network of complete streets</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DISTRICT STORMWATER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favoring pedestrians and bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide district stormwater system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over cars, with lighting, signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other landscape elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONNECTIONS BEYOND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DISTRICT PARKING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide district parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation systems, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park systems and adjacent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL SYSTEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and enhance natural systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including wetlands, Bridal Veil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeks, and Granary Corridor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY GARDENS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create community gardens on both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public and private property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC STRUCTURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve historic structures in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district. These include grain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elevators and Harris property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVERSITY OF HOUSING TYPES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that there is a mix of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income levels, ages, unit types and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sizes in housing including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for live/work units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATED UTILITY SYSTEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide restorative infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that includes renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generation, water and waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water treatment, solid waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recycling and other integrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECO-DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish sustainability guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the district as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options include: LEED-No, Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community challenge, and One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planet Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Market Demand

**Live | Residential**
- Significant existing student housing has ‘imprinted’ the area
- Competes with downtown and urban neighborhoods for non-student residents

**Play | Retail**
- High demand: 30,000 daily customers
- Needs pedestrian and driver-oriented retail
- Balance between daytime and residential population

**Work | Office**
- Not a primary office market in the region
- Opportunities to be closely connected to UMN

**Stay | Hotel**
- Strong demand from University and medical facilities
- Rate sensitivity
- Existing and proposed competition
- Other amenities (retail, restaurants) in area could be asset
Interviews, Focus Groups

- UMN Foundation
- College of Design
- College of Science and Engineering
- University Economic Development
- Vice President for Research
- Academic Health Center Research
- Alumni Association
- Housing and Residential Life
- College of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource Sciences

- University of MN Physicians
- Fairview
- Greater MSP
- MN Department of Employment and Economic Development
Project Type and Potential Size

---

**590,000 GSF**

- Play: 62,000 RSF
- Work: 150,000 RSF
- Live: 260 market-rate units
- Stay: 150 rooms - one hotel
- Other: None

**815,000 GSF**

- Play: 105,000 RSF
- Work: 215,000 RSF
- Live: 200 market-rate units
- Stay: 400 rooms - two hotels
- Other: 25,000 RSF Anchor Use

**1,081,000 GSF**

- Play: 92,000 RSF
- Work: 265,000 RSF
- Live: 300 market-rate units
- Stay: 400 rooms - two hotels
- Other: 25,000 RSF Anchor Use, 15,000 RSF Collab/Maker Space, 60,000 RSF Consolidated Labs

---

Scenario GSF Estimates:
- reflect general assumptions for gross up from RSF
- reflect rounded numbers
- do not include parking

---

Live | Residential
---|---
Play | Retail
Work | Office
Stay | Hotel
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
Density, Heights, Scale

View of 23rd Ave/Huron/University/Washington
Next Steps

• Continue to advance site planning
• Refine development project based on response to market interest, phasing potential
• Advance transportation and infrastructure planning with landowners and other jurisdictions
• Coordinate planning with adjacent areas (UMF, Prospect North)
Synergies and Interests

- Generate resources
- Bring opportunities for University’s mission activity (research, teaching, outreach)
- Support larger scale capital investment strategies (eliminate poor and critical space, provide the right type of space to support UMN activity)
DISCUSSION
AGENDA ITEM: Long-Range Campus Planning II: University Housing

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  X Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services
Robert McMaster, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Laurie McLaughlin, Director of Housing and Residential Life
Brian Swanson, Assistant Vice President

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to discuss the University’s housing strategy within the context of long-range campus planning. Key questions to consider include:

- Should the University continue to increase residence hall beds at a measured pace to avoid overbuilding and keep room and board rate increases as low as possible?
- Should the University continue to focus primarily on residence hall style housing for first and some second-year students, and rely on the private sector to provide apartment style housing for upper division students?

The University has a strong history of providing safe, affordable, convenient, and supportive housing to its students. This housing enhances the student experience, and is an important element of the first-year experience. Undergraduate students’ academic success is best served by starting their time at the University in University-owned, specially designed facilities with a high level of supportive services. University housing provides distinct facilities and programs that, in the aggregate, help students build a supportive social network while enrolled – the residence hall model. Institutional data show a clear correlation between a first-year and second-year University housing experience and higher GPA, higher retention rates, and higher four-year graduation rates. In addition to these measures, building an early relationship with the University enhances student affiliation and loyalty with the institution long after graduation.

For the past 25 years, growth in University housing has closely tracked the growth in the first-year class. In the mid-1990s, the University moved to guarantee all first-year students University housing if they submitted their housing application by May 1. That guarantee was one of several initiatives that led to increased student retention and higher four-year graduation rates. As the first-year class grew, the University added over 2,000 residence hall and apartment beds to support the institution’s goals.
Generally, the University has focused its available capital on a residence hall experience for first-year and some second-year students. It has relied on the interest and willingness of the private sector to invest in apartment-style housing for upper division students. This is the genesis of the transformation of the Twin Cities campus from a commuter campus to a more residential presence in the Minneapolis neighborhoods surrounding the University. With the exception of master leasing facilities (short-term leases that will not limit the institution’s debt capacity), there have been clearly established roles between University-owned and –operated housing and privately owned housing. Whether this distinction should continue as clearly is another question for the committee.

Today’s students are more connected than ever before. They come to campus with expectations that are very different from those of students in 1991. Yet even though students’ technology, creature comforts, and geographic home base have changed, the traditional residence hall model is still a key piece of a successful transition to college. Students and parents expect a community-based living model to be a part of their experience. The University consistently fills its residence halls to capacity, and approximately 60-70% of students returning for a second year in University housing choose residence halls over apartments. It should be noted that peer institutions continue to invest in residence hall-style housing for first- and second-year undergraduates. Those institutions are building community-focused residence hall housing in order to bring students together and create lasting connections that underpin the transition many students experience as they move further into their independent, young adult lives.

Affordability of student housing is a critical component of the overall cost of attendance. This year, the University has the lowest room and board rates in the Big Ten. As a self-supporting entity, Housing & Residential Life builds capital investments (renovation, repair, and new construction) into University housing rates. Debt service for the construction of new housing facilities has a significant impact on student housing rates. For example, the 17th Ave Residence Hall (600 beds + dining facility) resulted in a 10.7% increase in rates, which was phased in over several years. Almost all of the University’s residence halls are positioned for a long life, given proper maintenance and reinvestment. As long as this type of facility remains relevant, reinvestment vs. reconstruction is the most responsible use of student dollars and the best way to contain total cost of attendance. Housing & Residential Life remains one of the few entities at the University to fully fund depreciation. This is reflected in building conditions that are above average for their age.

The social and academic benefits of housing a critical mass of first-year students in a shared, low-density neighborhood environment close to the academic core of the campus is a unique distinction for the present-day Superblock. As the 30-year vision for the southeast gateway to the East Bank campus is put into action and land use changes, maintaining a critical mass of students in a co-located neighborhood will remain a top priority for the University.

**Housing Principles**

The following principles support decision making for University housing:

- **Safe** – Housing and the neighborhoods where the housing is located should provide a safe and healthy living environment.
- **Affordable** – Housing costs should align with the University’s financial aid model allowance for housing used in calculating the University’s total cost of attendance.
- **Convenient** – Housing should have readily available access to campus via transit, bicycle, walking, or other modes of convenient, affordable transportation, as well as access to the greater Twin Cities community.
• Supportive – Housing should offer appropriate levels of services and programs to support student success and community throughout their University career.
• Well-Maintained – Housing assets should be stewarded through managed costs, planned investment schedules and adequate resource allocation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Board of Regents has participated in the following recent presentations that inform this discussion related to student housing:

• Twin Cities Campus Planning: Housing Strategy and AHC Facilities (July 2015)
• Implementing the Master Plan: District Planning (June 2015)
• Annual Capital Budget (June 2015)
• Twin Cities Campus Student Housing Strategy (May 2015)
• Optimizing the University's Physical Assets: Facilities Condition Assessment (October 2014)
• Six Year Capital Plan (October 2014)
• Providing a Memorable Student Experience (May 2014)
• Auxiliary Services Capital Plan (May 2012)
• 4th Street Student Residence Hall and Dining Facility (December 2011)
• On-Campus Housing Demand and New Student Housing/Dining Project Executive Summary (June 2011)
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Introduction and Charge

In January 2015, Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson and Vice President Pamela Wheelock charged a committee to review of the University's student housing strategy for the Twin Cities campus and to develop recommendations for how the strategy should evolve to meet a changing market. Their full charge is included in Appendix A.

The Twin Cities Student Housing Strategy committee was asked to consider the following topics:

- Review and understand our current approach to student housing
- Understand and document the current student housing market – both demand and supply for various types of on-campus and off-campus housing
- Review best practices from other universities, including optimal mix of housing styles, public-private partnerships, historic preservation, and innovative new construction
- Develop guiding principles for evolving our housing strategy and program
- Identify a range of scenarios that pose governance options for University leaders and the Board of Regents as it relates to our housing strategy
- Develop the key components and recommendations for the May 2015 Board of Regents presentation

The committee has made progress on identifying both a framework for and key components of a comprehensive student housing strategy, and has developed preliminary recommendations for consideration by senior leadership. The committee has not completed all of the work required to fully define each component of the strategy. Additional work sessions will be needed and the committee envisions that it will continue to develop and evolve the details once senior leadership has provided guidance on the proposed strategy and preliminary recommendations. A summary of the committee’s approach appears in Appendix B.

A Housing Strategy Framework

The committee placed students at the core of its strategic review efforts. Members recognized early on that the wants and needs of undergraduate students change as they become more independent and progress toward graduation. These differences are even more pronounced for international, graduate, and professional students.

The committee’s housing strategy framework is structured around two axes – facility ownership and level of supportive services (see Appendix D for larger framework graphic). This housing strategy framework identifies eight broadly defined constituent groups, (beginning on page five). It also identifies a variety of supportive services, such as community advisors, living learning communities, community dining, and security, which are delivered at appropriately scaled levels to each constituent group.
It is the committee’s general approach that undergraduate students’ academic success is best served by starting their time at the University in University-owned facilities with a high level of supportive services. University housing provides distinct facilities and programs that, in the aggregate, help new students to build a supportive network while enrolled – the residence hall model. Examples of unique elements include community dining, educational and developmental programs, professional and student staff with specialized education and training, interaction between financial and student administrative systems to facilitate problem resolution if needed, and internal access to institutional supports. The University is best positioned to provide this highly supportive living and programming. This type of environment is not found in the private market.

As students progress through their academic career, the committee believes they should transition to housing with fewer and fewer supportive services. More recent housing developments offer some of the community amenities, though they typically focus on physical features such as study rooms or fitness centers. The remaining spectrum of supportive services in between can be delivered in numerous ways, through University ownership or involvement in a range of public-private partnerships. The private sector is able to provide an independent living environment and is already doing so.

**Assumptions**

The committee built its work around the following major assumptions:

- **The University will experience minimal enrollment growth.** The Twin Cities campus expects some modest growth in undergraduate enrollments over the next decade. Currently, the Twin Cities campus enrolls approximately 30,500 undergraduate students. Each year approximately 5,500 new first-year and 2,800 transfer students enroll in the seven freshman-admitting colleges. Estimates are that the undergraduate enrollment might increase to 32,000-33,000 students over the next decade through a modest increase in the first-year class. No incremental growth is planned for the Twin Cities transfer class, which matriculates 2,000-2,200 students in the fall and 650-700 students in the spring. Graduate programs will remain largely flat with limited growth in professional programs as market conditions allow.

- **The University District will remain an attractive location for private investment.** The University District is unique in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and in the state. Its location between the two central cities of the region, its demographics, and its outstanding amenities make it a prime area to accommodate a resurging interest in urban living. The district’s proximity to transit, employment, services, cultural attractions (sports, entertainment, and the arts), and world-class health care make it an attractive place to live for more than just current students. While the recent boom in student housing has peaked for the foreseeable future, these market forces will continue to shape the non-University housing market. Proposed development on the Green Line, such as Prospect Park North, is but one such example.

- **The line between on- and off-campus will continue to blur.** Since the University adopted its position to guarantee housing to first-year students just over twenty years ago, the campus has shifted from what was once a commuter-based academic experience to a residential experience. With students learning to live away from home in their first year, the need for
proximate housing increased as students wanted to stay near campus during subsequent years. This newer housing has also extended students’ living activity from a nine-month to a twelve-month lease cycle. Whether living in University-owned or privately-owned housing, students identify as living ‘on-campus’. This shift in perceived campus boundaries by students, parents, legislators, and the public was an underlying factor in the Board of Regents 2014 resolution recognizing the importance of creating a safe and vibrant surrounding community.

- **Aging housing stock around the University will be an increasing source of safety and livability problems.** Since 2000 it is estimated that over 15,000 new private student housing beds have been built (with over half of the new supply coming on-line between the 2013-14 and 2015-16 school years) based on number of construction permits issued at an average of three beds per unit. This significant new supply has pulled students from older, less amenity-rich housing in the Marcy-Holmes and Como neighborhoods, causing some distress in these older buildings that consist mainly of single-family homes and duplexes dating from the 1880s to the 1950s. Some of these properties have been under-invested in by absentee landlords for decades and while some structures can be saved and returned to good working condition, others are reaching the end of their useful life. The economics of acquiring the properties to restore them for rental or single-family use won’t underwrite given the increasing market values that stem from the amount of new development in the area.

- **Housing & Residential Life (HRL) remains a self-supporting auxiliary enterprise.** HRL is a self-supporting unit that is completely funded by room fees. Student services and programs, as well as all capital projects (new construction and renewal) and routine maintenance, are funded exclusively from room rate revenue. HRL fully funds depreciation on facilities and furnishings/equipment and maintains a robust facility repair and replacement (R&R) program. The committee assumed that these core elements of the HRL business model (Appendix G) remain in place. Other elements of the business model, such as occupancy and rate strategies, were not assumed to be fixed.

- **The University remains committed to student housing on the Superblock.** For several years, there has been discussion as to whether the Superblock will continue to be a cohesive residential neighborhood primarily focused on first-year students, or if the site will be repurposed over time for other institutional uses. This report assumes the Superblock site as a long-term location for University housing. See Appendix H for supporting information.

### A Comprehensive Student Housing Strategy

University efforts around student housing have historically focused on University-owned or University-managed housing. This University housing, historically referred to as “on-campus” housing, is only a small piece of the much larger and complex student housing picture. The University has two units presently charged with work related to student housing.

- **University Services.** Within University Services, HRL provides residence hall style housing, apartments, and family student housing cooperatives. HRL also manages the off-campus listing service, which serves as a clearinghouse for rental property targeted to students.
• **Student Affairs.** Within Student Affairs, the Off Campus Living Office works to connect students to the University, prepare them for non-University housing, and advocate for students with the larger private landlords in the University, Marcy-Holmes, Como, and Uptown neighborhoods. Also within Student Affairs, the Office for Fraternity and Sorority Life is responsible for advising Greek student leaders and members and supporting their programming endeavors.

*Recommendation 1: Establish a comprehensive student housing strategy that incorporates both University and non-University managed housing.*

Students today have many more housing choices in close proximity to the University than they had as recently as five years ago, and many upper-division students are choosing to live in these newer student-marketed buildings. Student success requires varying levels of supportive services during their academic career, many of which are illustrated in Appendix E. Whether living in University-managed housing or not, the University should expand its view of student housing to look more comprehensively at both University housing (owned or leased) and non-University housing. The committee believes the University should be committed to improving students’ experience beyond that which occurs in its own housing facilities. If the University is going to be an experiential, place-based institution with a large student population, it will need to be engaged, directly or indirectly, in more aspects of the non-University “place” than it has been in the past.

**Common Student Housing Principles**

*Recommendation 2: Adopt basic principles for what the University expects from both University and non-University student housing.*

The committee believes that there should be a set of common principles that guide the University’s approach to student housing regardless of type, ownership, or location. It is the opinion of the committee that all student housing should be:

- **Safe.** Housing and the neighborhoods where the housing is located should provide a safe and healthy living environment.
- **Affordable.** Housing costs should align with the University’s financial aid model allowance for housing used in calculating the University’s total cost of attendance.
- **Convenient.** Housing should have readily available access to campus via transit, bicycle, walking, or other modes of convenient, affordable transportation, as well as access to the greater Twin Cities community.
- **Supportive.** Housing should offer appropriate levels of services and programs to support student success and community throughout their University career.
Approaching Student Housing by Constituency

The committee identified eight broadly defined student housing constituency groups. Each group is discussed separately in this section. The report includes strategies and recommendations in the most appropriate section, although in some cases impacts may extend to more than one group. A full summary of recommendations appears in Appendix C.

Group A: First-Year Undergraduate Students (approximately 5,500 students)

Recommendation #3: Reaffirm the housing guarantee for all first-year students meeting the May application deadline and continue to make serving the housing needs of first-year students the University’s highest priority.

The committee feels strongly that first-year students are best served by the intentionally designed programs, supportive services, and community-building environment provided in University residence halls. There is overwhelming evidence that students who live in such an environment during their first year have higher GPAs, are retained at the University, and are more likely to graduate in four years (see Appendix L). First-year students living in University residence halls experience greater academic success and are more engaged in the University community.

Recommendation #4: Explore options for creating a need-based housing scholarship program to provide access to University housing for financially disadvantaged first-year students.

The University currently provides housing to eighty-eight percent of the incoming first-year class. While numerous personal and cultural circumstances will prevent this number from ever being 100 percent, the committee believes that the opportunity exists to increase the percentage of first-year students living in residence halls above ninety percent. The University has already initiated a survey to better understand why first-year students do not choose to live in University housing. Cultural, family, and financial circumstances are expected to be major factors in student and family decision-making. Any attempts to increase the number of first-year students living in University housing will need to include new financial incentives.

Recommendation #5: Limit expanded housing to residential, non-community spaces.

Many colleges and universities utilize expanded/overflow housing in order to accommodate as many students as desire to live in University housing. Use of expanded housing space is typically considered temporary (no longer than one semester) and consists of utilizing lounges or study rooms and/or increasing standard occupancy in resident rooms (i.e. adding a second student to a large single room, or a third student to a large double room). This committee spent a considerable amount of time on the topic of expanded housing and the role it plays in balancing the competing values of access, affordability, and the student experience. From a financial perspective, utilizing expanded housing enables housing programs to budget based on higher occupancy rates throughout the academic year, providing more students with access to University housing and keeping room rates lower. The most significant impact on the student experience results from placing students in lounges and other common spaces, which negatively impacts all students in the building by removing the use of these community spaces. Adding a third student to an over-sized
double room, on the other hand, has less of an impact on the overall community/student experience.

Dating back ten years, HRL was routinely placing 300-450 students in expanded housing each fall. HRL has, particularly since the opening of the 17th Avenue Residence Hall, decreased the amount of expanded housing and now budgets based on an over occupancy of 175 beds. The University should review its expanded housing practices and seek to limit expanded housing to spaces designed for residency and restrict expanded housing from using common spaces such as lounges and study rooms.

The committee reviewed several facility issues primarily, but not exclusively, impacting first year students. These are summarized below:

**Recommendation #6:** Initiate a comprehensive planning and predesign process for evaluating the full range of options for renovating or replacing Pioneer Hall and modernizing Superblock dining within the existing Superblock. The study should include the development of a financing plan and an evaluation of lower cost design and construction options.

- **East Bank.** University housing demand is highest on the East Bank, with the greatest demand centered on the Superblock facilities. The popularity of the Superblock is as much about proximity to campus as it is about the density of first-year students. First-year students want to live with other first-year students. Superblock dining facilities are obsolete and Pioneer Hall, the oldest residence hall on campus, requires a major capital investment to remain functional and meet even the basic expectations of today’s students with regard to room dimensions and overall functionality. Finding a solution to the Pioneer Hall and the Superblock dining facility condition issues are the highest University housing facility priorities.

**Recommendation #7:** University campus plans should evaluate demand for West Bank housing, particularly in concert with other new student services facilities.

- **West Bank.** University housing on the West Bank is currently concentrated in Middlebrook Hall. Although it poses challenges for students seeking an East Bank experience, its location serves to support living-learning communities with focuses on West Bank academic and cultural programs.

**Recommendation #8:** Evaluate options to make Bailey Hall more attractive to students and for increasing demand for students to live there. A broader assessment should identify services and amenities that would be required on the Saint Paul campus to create student demand for a residential experience there.

- **Saint Paul.** The Saint Paul campus has a look and feel distinct from the Minneapolis campuses. Undergraduate housing on the Saint Paul campus is limited to Bailey Hall, which poses challenges for students seeking (and expecting) an East Bank student experience.
Group B: Second-Year Undergraduate Students [approximately 6,500 students]

The committee believes that the University has the greatest potential to positively change the undergraduate experience by strengthening and formalizing a second-year experience program. Students who have established themselves through a first-year residence hall experience continue to show stronger success metrics when they are part of a second-year experience program. If the first year of college is about meeting friends, engaging in a supportive community, and becoming familiar with the campus and its resources and opportunities, the second year is about the student discovering his or her place in the broader campus and community. A formal second-year experience program provides a higher degree of support for this self-discovery process and contributes to retention and graduation. Research indicates that students who live in University housing for a second year have higher retention and graduation rates than those who don’t (see Appendix L.) It allows students to become more involved in the collegiate experience, weaving classroom work with co-curricular endeavors. This also aligns with the Office of Undergraduate Education’s new second-year experience initiative.

Recommendation #9: Research, plan, fund, and implement a formal second-year experience program in University housing and in partnership with non-University housing providers.

The University's current housing capacity does not allow for all second-year students to remain in University housing, nor do the majority of those students desire to do so. It is the opinion of the committee that a comprehensive second-year experience should be developed for second-year students who desire to live in University housing and in partnership with non-University housing providers, including the Greek community. Such partnerships could manifest themselves in a spectrum of activities, whether in the form of a master lease by the University (e.g., University Village), where the University remains responsible for the delivery of direct support to students and on-site programs, to a less structured model where the University works with the management of non-University buildings to provide formal (on-site) and informal (virtual) programmatic support to second-year students.

The committee recommends researching best practices and options with the goal of establishing target participation rates, determining program locations, developing program content and design, identifying funding, and determining the impact on University housing for second-year students.

Recommendation #10: HRL should give room selection priority to first-year students wishing to return to University housing for a second year.

Given the importance and transformational impact of second-year experience programs, the committee believes that the University should, as a starting point, make students interested in returning to University housing after their first year its second priority, ahead of upper-division students. A goal of 25% of second-year students living in University housing is a realizable target.

Group C: Transfer Students [approximately 3,000 students]

Students who begin their academic careers at other colleges or universities face unique challenges integrating into University life. Large numbers of transfer students express an interest in living in University housing in order to assist with their transition to the University.
Recommendation #11: Maintain HRL’s existing 200 transfer student commitment at present and increase that number as space permits.

The University, at present, has a limited ability to provide housing to transfer students. HRL currently guarantees a minimum of 200 University housing spaces for traditional transfer students during fall semester, and accepts an additional 250-300 in the spring. Fall wait lists, however, routinely extend into the hundreds.

Recommendation #12: Incorporate a larger but appropriately scaled transfer student program into the non-University partnership options being evaluated for an expanded second-year experience.

A majority of transfer students seeking University housing are in their third academic year, and do not require or desire the level of support services provided in first-year oriented programs. These students would be ideal candidates to participate in the types of partnership programs with non-University housing providers envisioned for a second-year experience.

Group D: Upper-Division Undergraduate Students (Third Year and Beyond) [approximately 19,000 students]

The University of Minnesota, given its location in the heart of a major metropolitan area, the heterogeneous housing markets serving multiple populations, and the volume of recent student-focused housing development near campus, is fortunate to have an adequate and diverse set of non-University housing options for students. The committee believes that the University should capitalize on this diversity of options and continue to rely on the non-University housing market to meet the needs of its upper-division undergraduate students. Recognizing the intersection of student desire for more independence and a diminishing impact of formal supportive services, students beyond the second year of their undergraduate careers can effectively be served by non-University housing. Students at this point in their undergraduate careers are well on their way to success but still benefit from some intentional connections to the University. There remain a small percentage of students who desire to live in University housing for their entire four-year career.

Recommendation #13: The University should engage non-University housing management on safety and livability issues.

The committee believes that upper-division undergraduate students and the surrounding communities are still best served by housing facilities that are designed for multi-tenant occupancy and that have professional on-site management. To this end the committee has recognized a need for the University (University Services, Student Affairs, Government and Community Relations, and the University of Minnesota Foundation) to engage its governmental and non-governmental partners on a wider range of non-University housing issues than it has in the past. Stronger efforts should be taken to engage private building owners and managers on safety, best management practices, and public realm livability issues. This work will require a concerted effort on the part of the University to appropriately define and structure its role in the near-campus neighborhoods. Any effort to expand the University’s involvement off-campus will require clear goals and objectives, as well as additional human and financial resources. The committee recommends reviewing best practices from around the country for models where universities, municipalities, and private owners have successfully worked together on student housing and livability issues.
The Off-Campus Living Office will continue to be an important resource for students navigating the landlord-tenant relationship and roommate issues, as well as keeping students connected to the University. An expanded role for the Off-Campus Living Office should be explored further in the context of an overall effort to clarify the University's role off-campus.

**Group E: Greek Community Housing** [approximately 1,000 students]

The University has a long and rich relationship with national and international fraternities and sororities. The first fraternities and sororities joined the University of Minnesota campus in 1874. While the University and the Greek chapters share a rich history and common interests, consistent with University policy, Greek chapters and governing councils are legally and financially independent of the University of Minnesota.

The University and the committee believe that fraternities and sororities contribute significantly and positively to the quality of the undergraduate experience. As stated in the University's 2012 *Greek Community Strategic Task Force* report, Greek chapter students have higher graduation rates and GPAs, and are heavily represented in student leadership positions on campus. Through their shared ideals and goals, they provide opportunities for the development of leadership skills, civic involvement, social growth, and binding relationships. Academics, leadership, brotherhood/sisterhood, member education, and community service are all important aspects of fraternity and sorority life.

**Recommendation #14: Support efforts to improve facility life/safety conditions in existing Greek housing facilities.**

The Task Force report section “Examining Housing and Facilities Opportunities” identified the need to improve the condition of the existing housing stock, leverage the opportunities provided by the opening of 17th Avenue Residence Hall, and add additional housing capacity to the Greek system. The University and the University of Minnesota Foundation are in the process of developing a housing loan program with the Greek community to provide additional resources for addressing Greek facility safety issues. Additional information on the proposed program is forthcoming. The University completed the proposed improvements to the 17th Avenue Residence Hall and has been operating a program with several Greek organizations since the facility opened. Progress has yet to be made on increasing the overall capacity of the Greek housing system.

**Group F: Affinity Housing Programs** [approximately 575 students]

Affinity housing continues to be a valuable component of the student experience. HRL currently operates three affinity group programs in University housing for Greeks, international students, and student athletes. The committee does not see any reason to alter the current affinity group programs. The allocation of beds should continually be evaluated against utilization, competing demands for beds, and the availability of any alternatives that can better meet student needs. At present, there are no recommendations for new affinity programs.
Group G: Graduate/Professional Students [approximately 15,800 students]

Graduate and Professional students are currently served almost exclusively by non-University housing providers. The University provides a limited amount of single student graduate student housing in its residence halls and apartment communities. There are no recommended changes to these existing programs.

Group H: Family Student Housing [unable to define total number of students]

Students with families are currently served almost exclusively by non-University housing providers. The University provides a limited amount of family housing in its Commonwealth Terrace and Como Community Cooperatives. These two facilities are resident-based management cooperatives operating under a management agreement with the University of Minnesota, which still owns the land and physical structures. There are no recommended changes to these existing programs.
January 8, 2015

To: Robert McMaster, Office of Undergraduate Education, co-chair
   Laurie Scheich, Auxiliary Services, co-chair
   Mannix Clark, Housing and Residential Life
   Liz Eull, President’s Office
   Sarah Harris, UMF Real Estate Advisors
   Lamar Hylton, Student Affairs
   Monique MacKenzie, Capital Planning and Project Management
   Laurie McLaughlin, Housing and Residential Life
   Brian Swanson, University Services Finance and Strategy
   Paige Rohman, University Services, staff to committee

From: Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
      Pamela Wheelock, Vice President of University Services

SUBJECT: UMTC Student Housing Strategy Committee

We are asking you to assist in the review of the University’s student housing strategy for the Twin Cities Campus and the development of recommendations as to how the strategy should evolve to meet changing market demands. The Board of Regents has requested a policy discussion of our student housing strategy at their May 2015 meeting. In order to prepare for this discussion, we are asking Laurie Scheich and Bob McMaster to convene you as a team to develop a shared understanding of our changing market conditions and best practices and then to develop recommendations as to how our student housing strategy needs to evolve. Specifically, the Student Housing Strategy Committee will be responsible for the following:

- Review and understand our current approach to student housing
- Understand and document the current student housing market – both demand and supply for various types of on-campus and off-campus housing
- Review best practices from other universities, including optimal mix of housing styles, public-private partnerships, historic preservation, and innovative new construction
- Develop guiding principles for evolving our housing strategy and program
- Identify a range of scenarios that pose governance options for University leaders and the Board of Regents as it relates to our housing strategy
- Develop the key components and recommendations for the May 2015 Board of Regents presentation

Thank you for your participation in this important project. We look forward to periodic updates as to your progress and to engaging with you on this effort.

cc: President Eric Kaler
    Vice President and CFO Richard Pfutzenreuter
    Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students Danita Brown Young
The committee met weekly or biweekly during the months of February, March, and April 2015. Members reviewed and discussed the following information and data in order to provide the members with context to help inform their work:

- University housing facility profile
- University housing occupancy data
- Academic success data related to first-year and second-year students
- Recent survey and focus group findings
- Residential programs and services
- Current occupancy management strategies for University housing
- Current policies and practices
- HRL’s business model
- Current University programs and services that support and assist students living in non-University housing
- Big Ten housing comparative data and information
- Non-University housing market data and research
- 2012 University Greek Community Strategic Task Force report
- Student housing trends and best practices

The committee identified the key components of a comprehensive housing strategy. These are included in the report beginning on page five. Based on these components, preliminary recommendations were developed to provide an overall direction for and implementation of the University’s housing strategy. Additional work is required to more fully define each component or segment of the overall strategy. The committee envisions that it will continue to develop and evolve the details once leadership has provided input and guidance on the proposed strategy and preliminary recommendations.
Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Establish a comprehensive student housing strategy that incorporates both University and non-University managed housing.

Recommendation 2: Adopt basic principles for what the University expects from both University and non-University student housing.

Recommendation 3: Reaffirm the housing guarantee for all first-year students meeting the May application deadline and continue to make serving the housing needs of first-year students the highest priority.

Recommendation 4: Explore options for creating a need-based housing scholarship program to provide access to University housing for financially disadvantaged first-year students.

Recommendation 5: Limit expanded housing to residential, non-community spaces.

Recommendation 6: Initiate a comprehensive planning and predesign process for evaluating the full range of options for renovating or replacing Pioneer Hall and modernizing Superblock dining within the existing Superblock. The study should include the development of a financing plan and an evaluation of lower cost design and construction options.

Recommendation 7: University campus plans should evaluate demand for West Bank housing, particularly in concert with other new student services facilities.

Recommendation 8: Evaluate options to make Bailey Hall more attractive to students and for increasing demand for students to live there. A broader assessment should identify services and amenities that would be required on the Saint Paul campus to create student demand for a residential experience there.

Recommendation 9: Research, plan, fund, and implement a formal second-year experience program in University housing and in partnership with non-University housing providers.

Recommendation 10: HRL should give room selection priority to first-year students wishing to return to University housing for a second year.

Recommendation 11: Maintain University housing’s existing 200 transfer student commitment at present and increase that number as space permits.

Recommendation 12: Incorporate a larger but appropriately scaled transfer student program into the non-University partnership options being evaluated for an expanded second-year experience.
**Recommendation 13:** The University should engage non-University housing management on safety and livability issues.

**Recommendation 14:** Support efforts to improve facility life/safety conditions in existing Greek housing facilities.
University Housing Profile

University owned traditional residence hall rooms and single-student apartments are supported solely by the rates charged to students. There is no institutional or state support for these facilities.

Facilities Overview

University owned single-student housing inventory currently includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Halls</th>
<th>5,890 beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Facilities</td>
<td>1,044 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,934 beds</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University housing first offered apartment facilities in 1996.

From 1996 through 2013, University housing added 2,080 new beds through new construction, additions, and renovations:

- 1996 134 beds, construction of Wilkins Hall (apartment style)
- 1999 148 beds, addition to Territorial Hall (residence hall style)
- 1999 412 beds, master lease of University Village (apartment style)
- 2000 170 beds, addition to Frontier Hall (suite style)
- 2001 167 beds, addition to Middlebrook Hall (suite style)
- 2002 435 beds, construction of Yudof Hall (apartment and suite style)
- 2003 14 beds, renovation of Sanford Hall (residence hall style)

Pod style housing: Pod style housing typically consists of pods of rooms (usually 4-8 rooms located in the same area) with a bathroom located near that pod that typically serves 8-16 students.

Occupancy Breakdown

- First-Year Students: 68.3%
- Second-Year Students: 15.2%
- Transfer Students: 3.3%
- Upper-Division Students: 6.4%
- Graduate and Professional Students: 0.8%
- Other (includes staff): 6.0%

Food Service

Meal plans are mandatory for all traditional residence hall students and are optional for apartment residents. The concept of community dining is a key supportive strategy in the residence hall experience.
HRL is a self-supporting auxiliary business enterprise of the University of Minnesota. As such it is required to generate all of its own revenues and pay for all of its expenses.

In recent years HRL has, at the direction of University leadership, prioritized rate and cost control above other aspects of managing the housing and residential life business. This focus on rate control as part of an effort to hold steady the overall cost of attendance has pushed the University’s housing rates to the lowest among its Big 10 peers but done so at the expense of other facility and programmatic priorities. Adopting and implementing policy, program, and facility changes aimed at improving the student experience will require additional resources and a change in the past practice of prioritizing “low cost” over other competing values.

HRL’s operating budget for single student housing includes funding for a wide variety student support services and programs not universally available to students in non-University housing. These include live-in professional staff, community advisors, 24/7 on-site management, utilities, student common spaces, and intentionally designed educational and social programs that focus on student development learning outcomes and community building.

In addition to funding the programs and services noted above, HRL also funds facilities costs for long-term improvements and on-going annual maintenance/repair costs in all residence halls and apartments, including residential dining facilities. HRL fully funds depreciation, which is used to pay for all capital projects, renewals/replacements, and furnishings/equipment in the residence halls, apartments, and residential dining facilities. HRL transfers operating funds derived from depreciation into reserve accounts, which fund capital projects and equipment replacements. In addition, any operating budget windfalls such as utilities savings due to warm winter temperatures are transferred to reserve accounts to provide additional funds for renewals and replacements. Construction of new facilities or additions to existing buildings is financed by University issued bond debt, with the principal and interest paid for by HRL through room rate revenue.

HRL prepares a Ten Year Capital Plan, which itemizes the capital projects, renewals/replacements, and equipment purchases on an annual basis. Utilizing current depreciation and projected depreciation from the Ten Year Capital Plan, a five year cash flow projection is prepared to balance planned capital expenditures with available funding.
## HRL Budget Overview

**April 2015**

### Consolidated 2015 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$48,720,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Revenue:** $48,720,200

### Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll - Staff</td>
<td>$6,352,400</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll - Students</td>
<td>$2,997,700</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$1,742,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>$3,247,500</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Lease</td>
<td>$2,333,500</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities - Electric, Water, Sewer, Steam, Garbage</td>
<td>$6,178,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Telephone</td>
<td>$2,709,800</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>$4,232,200</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Service</td>
<td>$738,100</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$294,400</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating</td>
<td>$1,340,600</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Reimbursement</td>
<td>$(4,456,100)</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Expenses:** $28,425,300

### HRL Operating Margin

$20,294,900

### Capital Improvements Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt: Principle and Interest</td>
<td>$6,807,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRL Capital Renewal/Depreciation</td>
<td>$11,198,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Capital Renewal/Depreciation</td>
<td>$1,236,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$19,242,300

### Institutional Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP/GIP Earnings</td>
<td>$(198,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU OIT Charges</td>
<td>$1,304,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise System</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Expenses:** $1,456,712

### Net Institutional Position

$-(404,112)*

*planned deficit as part of multi-year phase-in of 17th Avenue Residence Hall expenses
This memo serves as a midpoint update on the work of the Twin Cities Housing Strategy Committee, charged by you on January 8, 2015. To date the committee’s work has been focused on understanding the specifics of our University housing program as well as some of the details related to both the market for and services provided in non-University housing. In the course of these meetings, it has become clear that the group cannot productively address the full list of topics outlined in its charge without first understanding and obtaining clear direction from University leadership on the future of Centennial, Frontier, Pioneer, and Territorial Halls, collectively known as the Superblock.

For several years, there has been discussion as to whether the Superblock site will continue to be a cohesive residential village or if the site will be repurposed over time for other institutional uses. It is the strong recommendation of this committee that the University should commit to the Superblock site as a long-term location for University housing. We make this unanimous recommendation for several reasons outlined in the following paragraphs.

A quality community-building first-year residential experience is critical to long-term academic success, retention, and high levels of student engagement. Students who start their University career in residence halls fare better than those who do not. The University’s data, collected over the past decade, show a clear distinction between the retention and graduation rates of those who start their career in University housing vs. those who do not. GPAs are 0.2 – 0.3 points higher. Retention is 4-9% higher. Four-year graduation rates are 10-14% higher. The impact of campus living on student success is very clear and is, in fact, the number 1 predictor of first-year retention.

Research related to college and university student housing indicates that there is “remarkably consistent evidence that residential students are more likely than commuters to persist and graduate from college” (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Additionally, research indicates that “students who live on campus participate in more events (extracurricular, social and cultural); have more informational interactions with peers and faculty; and are also more likely to persist and graduate” (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Pascarella, Terenzini & Blimling, 1994), and that students who live in University housing “experienced smoother social and overall adjustment, as well as institutional attachment as a result of higher levels of interpersonal closeness and feelings of connection” (Kaya, 2004).
The Superblock provides the style of first-year housing experience parents and students are seeking. The University is in the unique position of having the style of residential communities that best support the first-year student experience and student success. The residence hall model focuses on community living and achieves this through design of space that encourages and supports student interaction and community involvement (including shared dining, bathrooms, social lounges/study lounges) and professional staff with Masters Degrees who are focused on student development, including utilization of a residential curriculum model. Students do not make connections, develop relationships, or engage with and integrate into the University in the same way when they live in apartment style housing, which enables students to self-isolate by having many amenities within their apartment unit (kitchen facilities, private bathrooms, living room, private bedrooms.) University housing plays an important role in supporting the University’s admissions strategy by providing a first-year student housing guarantee and housing communities that promote and support student engagement and success.

The Superblock is a highly desirable, hard to replicate first-year focused neighborhood. The Superblock is unique in its provision of a neighborhood community within an urban setting. For many decades, the Superblock has been the preferred destination for first-year students seeking the type of large and concentrated student “neighborhood” that this historical site provides. There is sufficient density, green space, adjacency to the heart of the East Bank campus, and access to transit to create a community that would be difficult to replicate elsewhere. The popularity of the Superblock is as much about proximity to campus as it is about the density of like-minded first-year students. First-year students want to live with other first-year students.

Relocating the Superblock is not financially feasible. Housing & Residential life is totally funded from room and board fees. The University has worked hard to keep the cost of room and board low, and this year is within $24 of being the lowest in the Big Ten. A full replacement of the Superblock on a new site or sites would be prohibitively costly without pulling University resources away from academic programs or displacing other University capital priorities. Early estimates suggest that the cost to replace the Superblock capacity in new facilities would cost in excess of $425 million, assuming that a sufficient quantity of contiguous, acceptable land on the East Bank could even be assembled to accommodate a replacement first-year focused housing village. The debt service costs on such an investment could not be supported by housing rates without roughly doubling a student’s room rate. Conversely, the University’s Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) shows only a fraction of that level investment being required in the four Superblock residence halls in the near future. This level of investment is already addressed in Housing & Residential Life’s capital renewal plans. Furthermore even in buildings requiring major programmatic and infrastructure changes in excess of those required by the Superblock facilities, (e.g. Tate Laboratory of Physics), renewal generally costs less than 75 percent of new construction.

Alternatives now exist for competing Superblock land uses. The University’s recent acquisition of Block 31 situated along Huron Boulevard and adjacent to the Ambulatory Care Clinic provides an outlet for potential future expansion of medical activities by either the University or its partner organizations that do not require the relocation of the Superblock.

In summary, the University’s current first-year focused residence hall model works well and is utilized nation-wide. If the University did not already have a Superblock equivalent, it is what we would be seeking to create. In this overbuilt student housing market, students and parents continue to value the kind of first-year experience provided by the residential communities that are part of the Superblock. With clear direction from University leadership on whether or not the
future of the Superblock as a site suitable for further housing investment, the committee is
prepared to move forward in its work charting a direction for our evolving housing strategy and
program, including the current self-financing business model, role of public/private partnerships, a
more formalized second-year experience program, the evolving role of parents, facility investments,
and the non-University housing environment.

We would be happy to discuss this recommendation with you, and hope to have such a commitment
in time to inform the committee’s final meetings before the Board of Regents’ docket deadline in
April.
# Market Inventory

Marquette Advisors conducted a market study in winter 2015. Data collected provide the following snapshot of the Twin Cities student housing market:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University residence halls and apartments</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>6,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University by-the-bed apartments</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>9,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University by-the-unit apartments</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>3,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2015 Supply</td>
<td>9,940</td>
<td>19,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non-University by-the-bed apartments under construction | 600 | 1,685 |
| Winter 2016 Projected Inventory                | 10,540 | 21,480 |
Marquette Advisors’ winter 2015 market study coupled with institutional data found the following rent ranges in the Twin Cities student housing market:

### For private bedroom leases:
- University apartments: $640-$670
- Greek houses*: n/a
- Non-University by-the-bed apartments**: $600-$1,500
- Non-University by-the-unit apartments**: $470-$1,045

### For shared bedroom leases:
- University apartments: $520-$640
- Greek houses*: $500-$900
- Non-University by-the-bed apartments**: $300-$800
- Non-University by-the-unit apartments**: $235-$525

*Greek house rent includes social dues, some provide board and utilities.  
**Non-University apartments vary from 1-4 bedrooms and include private and shared bedrooms.

University apartment and Greek house leases are nine-month terms.
Housing Capacity
Big Ten institutions’ fall 2014 University housing capacity and ratio of beds to undergraduate enrollment for University housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Beds:Undergrads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern*</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland*</td>
<td>12,244</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10,175</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>11,904</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>13,588</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7,305</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6,229</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin*</td>
<td>7,409</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State*</td>
<td>10,855</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota*</td>
<td>6,934</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Rates
Big Ten institutions’ 2014-2015 University housing rates for standard, double-occupancy residence hall style rooms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Room Only</th>
<th>Room+Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern*</td>
<td>$8,352</td>
<td>$14,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>$7,092</td>
<td>$11,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland*</td>
<td>$6,424</td>
<td>$10,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$6,222</td>
<td>$10,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$5,806</td>
<td>$10,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$5,711</td>
<td>$9,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>$5,460</td>
<td>$9,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State*</td>
<td>$6,070</td>
<td>$9,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$6,293</td>
<td>$9,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>$4,860</td>
<td>$9,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$6,339</td>
<td>$9,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$9,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota*</td>
<td>$4,920</td>
<td>$8,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin*</td>
<td>$5,546</td>
<td>$8,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These institutions represent peers with diverse housing markets influenced by factors other than simply being adjacent to their university, and are those most similar to the University of Minnesota.
**Current/Planned Construction**

These Big Ten institutions are presently building or planning to build University housing of the type(s) indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Type and Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>residence hall (double rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>residence hall (suite style), 2/3 double rooms and 1/3 single rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>residence hall (double rooms), replaces 360 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland*</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>residence hall (pod style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>apartment style, graduate student focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>apartment style, replaces 1,100 apartment beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>residence hall (pod style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern*</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>residence hall (suite style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State*</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>residence hall (double rooms), some suite style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>residence hall (double rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>residence hall (pod style)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suite style housing: Suites typically consist of more than one sleeping room with a shared private bath. Some suites also include a small common room and kitchenette (no stove/oven).

Pod style housing: Pod style housing typically consists of pods of rooms (usually 4-8 rooms located in the same area) with a bathroom located near that pod that typically serves 8-16 students.

*These institutions represent peers with diverse housing markets influenced by factors other than simply being adjacent to their university, and are those most similar to the University of Minnesota.

**Live-On Requirement**

The following Big Ten institutions require their first-year students to live on campus:

- Illinois
- Indiana
- Michigan State
- Nebraska
- Ohio State**
- Penn State

**Ohio State is in the process of implementing a requirement for second-year students to live on campus as well.
Retention and Graduation Data

First to Second Year Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Students</th>
<th>Non Housing Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second to Third Year Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2 Years Live on Campus</th>
<th>1 Year Live on Campus</th>
<th>Non Housing Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four-Year Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Live on Campus</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years Live on Campus</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Housing Students</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First-Year Student GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Students</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Housing Students</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction and Charge

In January 2015, Senior Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson and Vice President Pamela Wheelock charged a committee to review the University’s student housing strategy for the Twin Cities campus and to develop recommendations for how the strategy should evolve to meet a changing market. Their full charge is included in *Appendix A* of the original report. The committee made progress on identifying both a framework for and key components of a comprehensive student housing strategy, and developed preliminary recommendations for consideration by senior leadership. The committee, however, required additional time and information to complete all of the work required to fully define each component of the strategy in its original report.

This addendum to the original report completes the work of the committee and provides more detail on specific strategies for *University housing*, particularly as they relate to the concurrently produced Campus Development Framework.

Determining the Demand for University Housing

The demand for University Housing is driven by the University’s enrollment management plan, specifically the first-year student enrollment target. Housing & Residential Life (HRL), and its inventory of managed housing (both owned and leased) exists solely to support the academic mission of the University. HRL, as a self-supporting auxiliary unit, supports the academic enterprise by providing an adequate supply of quality, affordable student housing with the appropriate supportive services and programs.

Five factors drive demand for University housing (owned and leased):

- **Size of First-Year Undergraduate Class.** The size of the University’s first-year class is the largest single factor affecting the demand for University housing. The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) has proposed the new fall 2017 first-year enrollment goal be increased from the current base of 5,550 students to 5,800 students, a 250-student increase. In recent years, however, the entering class has exceeded the 5,550 target so the impact of the proposed change to University housing is less than it initially appears. Longer term, the goal is to be in the 6,000 range. HRL will continue to work with OUE as goals are put into action.

- **First- and Second-Year Capture Rates.** The first-year student yield rate (the percentage of the first-year class requesting housing by the May 1 deadline plus those first-year students on the post-May 1 deadline wait list that can be accommodated) is the next most significant variable impacting housing demand. In recent years, the first-year undergraduate yield rate has been approximately 89%. The second-year student capture rate has been approximately 18-20% of the first-year class in recent years.

- **Transfer Students.** HRL currently reserves 200 spaces for the approximately 2,200 transfer students entering the University each fall. OUE increased the fall 2017 the transfer enrollment goal from the current base of 2,200 students to 2,325 students, a 125-student increase. Increasing the transfer allocation affects the overall demand for University housing (owned and leased).
• **Wait List.** HRL currently maintains an annual wait list of approximately 250 students, comprised mainly of transfer students and students who did not live in University housing the previous year but desire to live in University housing.

HRL has adopted the following occupancy goals, for purposes of occupancy management and demand planning, as recommended by the Twin Cities Housing Strategy report:

• **First-Year Undergraduate Students:** 90% of the entering class requires housing, primarily in residence halls. For an entering class of 5,800, this would result in a first-year undergraduate student demand of 5,220.

• **Second-Year Undergraduate Students:** 25% of the first-year students returning for a second year experience in University managed (owned or leased) housing. The current demand varies between 18-20%, so a 25% goal remains aspirational. This demand, as it is realized, will be met in a mix of residence hall rooms and apartment-style units. It should be noted that for fall 2016, 70% of the first-year students who applied to return to University housing for a second year signed up for a space in a traditional residence hall. Should the University achieve its goal, a base of 5,220 students would result in a second-year undergraduate demand of 1,305.

The number of students who wish to remain in University housing after their first year is limited. The current goal of retaining 25% of the first year students is, in all likelihood, the maximum the University could achieve without mandating a multi-year residency requirement. Students routinely cite a desire for a less structured environment, more independence, and less oversight as reasons for not returning to University housing for a second year.

• **Transfer Students:** 10% of the entering fall transfer student class. This demand will be met in a mix of apartment-style units and residence halls. For a transfer class of 2,325 this would result in a total demand of roughly 235 students.

• **Availability of Expanded Housing.** Limiting expanded housing to residential, non-community spaces (not housing students in lounges) reduced the overall supply of beds by approximately 150-200 spaces.

The chart that follows is an example of how future projected demand for University housing, based on achieving the assumptions outlined above, relates to current housing capacity.
### Student Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected Undergraduate Housing Demand</th>
<th>Residence Hall Style</th>
<th>Apartment Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Students</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>Exact Numbers Vary Annually</td>
<td>Exact Numbers Vary Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Students</td>
<td>1,305(^1)</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfer</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved International</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third/Fourth-Year Students</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait List Estimate</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,590-1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,955-6,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,590-1,745</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assignable Capacity(^1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,028</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmet Projected Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>914</strong></td>
<td><strong>195-350</strong></td>
<td><strong>565-720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Should the percentage of first-year students returning to University housing for a second year remain at 20%, the demand for University housing will drop by approximately 250 students.

\(^2\) The current assignable capacity excludes 170 community advisor beds and all expanded housing.

### Meeting Demand for University Housing

The University has multiple tools available for it to meet the housing needs of its diverse student body. The shift in the past two decades away from the commuter campus model and towards the current near campus model has dramatically changed the housing landscape. The University currently balances risks and rewards in meeting student housing needs by relying on the following four strategies:

- **Building and managing its own housing.** The University’s strategy is to own and manage all residence hall facilities. As previously presented, it is generally agreed that undergraduate students’ academic success is best served by starting their time at the University in University-owned facilities with a high level of supportive services. University housing provides distinct facilities and programs that, taken together, help new students to build a supportive network while enrolled – the residence hall model. This type of environment is not found in the private market. The University is solely responsible for ensuring that it has an adequate supply of residence hall facilities to meet its demand for primarily first-year student housing.

  The University also owns two apartment-style facilities constructed prior to the current wave of private sector apartment construction. The University does not anticipate adding more apartment-style units to its inventory of owned facilities.

- **Master leasing existing private market housing facilities.** The University currently master leases 417 beds (approximately 50%) of the University Village apartment complex just east of the Minneapolis campus. The University has master leased space in this facility since it
opened in 1999. Under this arrangement, the University pays rent to the building owner and HRL in turn manages occupancy, collects rent, and staffs the units in the area it leases. All HRL policies and procedures apply to the occupants and essentially, from a student perspective, the facility operates just like any other University residence hall or apartment.

The demand analysis work done by HRL indicates that, at a minimum, it is necessary to retain the current number of apartment-style beds to meet the current demand for University housing. As the University increases first-year student and transfer student enrollment targets and develops strategies to retain more first-year students in University housing for a second year, it will likely need to expand the number of apartment spaces in order to meet the increasing demand. This demand is evaluated annually to determine if additional leased space is required.

If additional leased apartment space is required, the University will enter into an agreement with a private developer via University purchasing requirements. The University would anticipate exclusive use and management of any building(s) it master leases.

Master leasing existing apartments in desirable locations near campus provides the University with the best opportunity to achieve its goal of retaining 25% of first-year students in University housing. Master leasing has the additional advantages of not impacting University credit, providing great flexibility for managing the variability of student demand over time, and allowing the University to respond to new options in the student-focused apartment marketplace.

- **Relying on the private real estate market surrounding campus.** The University relies on the private real estate market to meet the housing needs of the majority of its second-year, upper division, graduate, and professional students. This market has seen a significant amount of change in recent years. The University is fortunate that the private sector, at its expense, has provided University students with more housing choices than have existed in the past.

The University obtains data each year from Marquette Advisors on the private (non-University) housing market surrounding campus. Information is obtained on average apartment rents as well as the capacity and vacancy rates in the larger complexes. The information for 2016 including rates, capacity, and occupancy is not yet available. However, data from the past year’s report as well as more recent anecdotal information indicates that the private market immediately surrounding the Twin Cities campus has surplus capacity, which has led to strong price competition.

- **Developing innovative philanthropic partnerships.** Jim Cargill gifted Dinnaken Properties to the University of Minnesota Foundation in order to continue his interest in supporting students with quality, affordable housing during their academic pursuits. The Foundation’s subsidiary, UMF Real Estate Advisors, manages these nearly 1,000 beds with an emphasis on providing well-maintained and safe housing. Rents are below market. As with University housing, on-site management and maintenance operations provide 24/7/365 presence.
Public Private Partnerships (P3s)

One of the continuing trends in government contracting is the usage of public-private partnerships, or P3s, as a way to build partnerships between the public and private sector. P3 relationships can transcend a broad degree of topics from taking responsibility for the day-to-day operations of a governmental function to the total privatization of an activity. In some instances, design/build activities related to a construction project are cited as an example of a P3.

A review of the literature regarding the definition of a P3 indicates that there are many differing opinions on what constitutes such a relationship. The University of Minnesota has defined a P3 as a contractual agreement between the University of Minnesota and a non-governmental entity to support a mission related purpose or to support ongoing operations in which the University retains a defined role in all or some aspect of the following: 1) ownership, 2) regulation, or 3) remediation on non-performance. P3s differ from the purchase of goods and/or services from a vendor or from total privatization of a function. The University also excludes from its definition the leasing of space from the private sector.

While some universities across the country have utilized a P3 model to increase their on-campus housing capacity, this is not a model that has been used at the University of Minnesota. It is evident that universities base their decision to utilize P3 on any number of factors that are unique to their specific institution, and that each institution evaluates its situation differently, weighing the pros and cons against their unique circumstances. Common considerations among institutions exploring a P3 include the following:

- Does the P3 support the accomplishment of a mission goal?
- Does the institution have the financial resources to fund the project?
- Does a P3 provide a net long-term financial benefit to the institution?
- Does the University have the necessary land available to accommodate the new construction?
- Does the P3 arrangement bring to the table a specific expertise or capability that the institution lacks?
- Does the institution have the institutional/professional expertise necessary to own and operate the facilities?
- All other variables considered, is the project able to reduce delivery time and at a lower cost than a conventional institutional approach?
- Does the University face regulatory or other restrictions that would prohibit the University from doing the project itself?
- Does the project require the subordination of university land to the long term financing of the project?
- Is the project designed to meet a temporary or long-term need?
- What is the level and nature of risk sharing between the institution and the P3 provider?
- How will the rating agencies view the project?
- Where does the P3 proposal fall in terms of its impact on the balance sheet of the institution?
- What is the cost of capital?

As the University has the ability to issue its own debt, the authority and experience to manage its own construction and on-going operations, owns a sufficient quantity of land, and has placed its strategic focus on owning and operating residence halls (a segment of the market not typically
addressed by private developers or P3s) there appears to be limited value in pursuing a P3 for University-owned undergraduate student housing.

That is not to say, however, that consideration of P3s should be removed from the University's toolkit to meet other pressing mission-related needs or objectives. Each potential idea or opportunity should be evaluated on its own merits using the considerations outlined above.

A New Opportunity: Aligning with Campus Development Framework

Concurrent with the institution’s work on defining a more comprehensive University Housing Strategy, Capital Planning and Project Management (CPPM) has undertaken the creation of a forward-looking campus development model to act as a framework for guiding decision making about campus evolution over time. The draft model suggests the most appropriate areas for functions, buildings, infrastructure, and connections. It also identifies the most appropriate locations for significant campus growth and change based on access, function, and form.

Both the Campus Development Framework and recently completed Academic Health Center Strategic Facilities Plan envision a future change for Southeast Gateway, which includes the undergraduate student housing and academic health sciences ‘core’ areas south of Washington Avenue as well as the clinical health sciences area west of Huron Boulevard and north of Fulton Street. The vision for the Southeast Gateway shows how these two uses can coexist successfully, based on the available land controlled by the University today, as well as the potential to recapture development sites once large-scale structures such as the Mayo Building, Diehl Hall, the current MHealth Hospital, Boynton/Children’s Rehabilitation Center Building, and Variety Club Research Center are demolished.

The thirty-year vision for the Southeast Gateway shows an eventual migration of housing from the Centennial and Territorial sites to the current site of the MHealth Hospital, Variety Club Research Center, and Boynton/Children’s Rehabilitation Center Building. This planning opens up new opportunities to create a new residential neighborhood connecting student housing to the river, as well as to knit the academic and clinical activities of the University’s health sciences programs. A conceptual image of the campus south of Washington Avenue is found in Appendix M: Southeast Gateway Thirty-Year Vision.

Continued Reinvestment in Existing Housing Facilities

The long-term vision for the Southeast Gateway provides more clarity for HRL on the future of the four Superblock facilities. With the Pioneer Hall and Frontier Hall sites clearly dedicated to long-term residential use, these are the logical locations for making new, major housing and dining investments. The vision also makes clear that for the foreseeable future, until additional building sites are available along the river, the University should continue to make the necessary investments in Centennial Hall and Territorial Hall to keep them safe, functional, “fresh,” and up-to-date.

Overall, the University-owned housing facilities on the Twin Cities campus are relatively well maintained compared to other University facilities. Because HRL fully funds depreciation, it is able
to regularly fund both long-term improvements and on-going annual maintenance/repair costs in all University residence halls and apartments, including residential dining facilities.

The University's Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) shows that from a systems, infrastructure, and accessibility perspective Pioneer Hall is in the worst shape of all of the University’s residence halls. Furthermore, Pioneer Hall requires an immediate major capital investment to remain operational and meet even the basic expectations of today's students with regard to room dimensions, community and study space, and overall functionality. Finding a solution to the Pioneer Hall condition issues is the highest University housing facility priority.

Ongoing investment will also be required in the University’s other undergraduate housing facilities. The University's limited financial ability to wholly replace its existing facilities makes a well-developed modernization strategy an essential component of the overall housing strategy. Unlike a research laboratory, where the fundamental requirements of a space changes over time, the core elements of a residence hall do not change. With adequate investment to keep the spaces “fresh,” up to date, and appealing, the University’s existing inventory of housing should continue to serve the needs of students for the foreseeable future. As part of its goal to develop a long-term renewal and reinvestment strategy for every building (the Building by Building Strategy), each housing facility will be further evaluated to determine the types of investments that make sense.

While it has been suggested that the residence hall model is outdated and does not enhance our competitive position, it has been reinforced by our peers that for first-year student housing the residence hall model continues to be the hallmark in student living. One of the biggest concerns raised by first-year students is whether they will meet people and form meaningful friendships. Residence halls, by design, make it difficult for students to “self-isolate”. Students live and interact in a community environment, whether that is for dining, recreational space, lounging, or even going down the hall to the shared bathroom facilities. Community-based living is a core element of the first-year experience.

Next Steps for Pioneer Hall and Superblock Dining

The original Twin Cities Student Housing Strategy report (April 2015) included a recommendation (Recommendation 6) to, “initiate a comprehensive planning and predesign process for evaluating the full range of options for renovating or replacing Pioneer Hall and modernizing Superblock dining within the existing Superblock. The study should include the development of a financing plan and an evaluation of lower cost design and construction options.” CPPM issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) and has retained a firm to address this recommendation.

The scope included in the RFP requested comprehensive feasibility study and predesign services for evaluating the full range of options for modifying Pioneer Hall and options for dining facilities to meet the needs of the students living on the Superblock. Initial parameters requested that the program 1) provide housing facilities, as well as the necessary community, recreational, office, and support spaces for 700-800 students and 2) provide for the dining needs of 2,800-2,900 Superblock residents. Space within the building will provide adequate common area space to foster community building/student interaction (including, but not limited to community and floor lounges, main building lounge/meeting spaces, recreation areas, etc.) and designated individual and group study/learning spaces that support academic success (including state-of-the-art technology/computer support space).
During the initial phase of the feasibility study, the University is asking the design team to examine and illustrate a range of alternative approaches that test the varying degrees to which Pioneer Hall can be adapted, modified, or replaced to accommodate the program requests for both the student housing and consolidated dining services projects. This analysis is expected to include a review of current best practices for first-year focused residential design as well as ways to incorporate design and construction innovations. One key component of the feasibility study will be to determine the most appropriate response to Pioneer Hall as a potentially eligible historic resource.

HRL staff is also in the process of developing a plan to accommodate students who will be displaced from Pioneer Hall during renovation/construction. First-year students will continue to be placed in residence halls, but this relocation plan will force more second-year and transfer students from residence halls into apartments during the project.

**Budgeting for Future Replacement and Limited New Construction**

HRL’s current rate structure places the University of Minnesota at the bottom of its Big 10 peer group for annual room and board cost. The decision to keep rates low was a deliberate attempt to assist in minimizing the total cost of attendance for students choosing to live in University housing. HRL’s current rate structure allows for the continued reinvestment in the building systems that has occurred in recent years. Holding rates low, however, has limited and continues to limit HRL’s ability to undertake a more aggressive refreshing and modernization program in its existing housing inventory. It should be noted that the cumulative facility needs of both Pioneer Hall and Superblock-area dining cannot be addressed under the current rate structure.

Moving HRL residence hall rates closer to the Big 10 peer group average, while continuing to keep University apartment rates market competitive locally, will allow the University to address Pioneer Hall, as well as to fund a major investment in Superblock dining. Continuing to keep University housing rates at or near the Big 10 peer group average would allow the University to undertake a major facility replacement project once every eight to ten years while still maintaining the remaining stock, balancing facility-related costs and debt with affordability.
Appendix M: Southeast Gateway 30-Year Vision

DRAFT CONCEPT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

30 year vision
University Housing...

- Works hard to support admissions and enrollment decisions
- Understands student and parent perspectives
- Provides a product that meets program goals
- Focuses on first-year and some second-year students (generally)
- Relies on Greek housing and private sector development near campus for upper divisions students
- Balances market interest with affordability
Housing Strategy Framework

Non-University Housing vs University Housing

- Supportive Services
- Fully Independent
- First Year
- Graduation
Supportive Services Matrix

- Community Advising
- Student Development and Community Programming
- Community Adviser
- On-Site Management
- Study Rooms
- Building Amenities
- Proximity

- Residence Halls
- First Year and Affinity; Some Second, Transfer
- University-Owned, Managed, or Programmed Apartments
- Second Year and Transfer; Some Upper Division
- Post-2000 Private Housing
- Upper Division Graduate/Professional
- Pre-2000 Private Housing
- Graduate/Professional Student Families

- Independent Living (established students)
- Full Support Living (newest students)
University Housing:
THE PAST 25 YEARS
1991-2016: Quick Hits

- Enrollment has driven housing growth
  - First-year housing guarantee began in mid-1990s
- Planned expansion of housing stock
  - University focus primarily on residence halls for first-year (and some second-year) students
  - Private market has built near-campus apartments to meet need without involving University capital or debt capacity
  - Master leases have supplemented University-operated apartment stock
- Affordability a high priority
Economics of University Housing

- Room and board rates are directly impacted by debt
- University housing rates must be reasonably competitive with non-University housing costs
- Traditional double rooms with community bath and spaces for social and study use remain the standard across the country
- Most residence halls can be modernized and refreshed and will have a useful life for decades to come
Cost of Attendance: 25 Years

- Tuition:
  - $2,000
  - $4,000
  - $6,000
  - $8,000
  - $10,000
  - $12,000
  - $14,000

- Room/Board:
  - $1,000
  - $2,500
  - $4,000
  - $5,500
  - $7,000
  - $8,500
  - $10,000

Graph shows the trend from 1991 to 2015.
Current Housing Stock

- Residence Halls on average in better physical condition than academic and research facilities due to funded depreciation and ongoing maintenance
  - facilities are still relevant and meet student expectations
  - renovation vs replacement assessed on an ongoing basis
- Apartments support overall capacity
  - fill gap for those who want more independence in an environment that is still supportive
  - master leases allow apartment stock to evolve with student trends, meet demands, and test market interest
Public/Private Partnerships (P3s)

- Nearly all P3s across the country are for apartments (not for residence halls)
- Apartment stock is already built near the Minneapolis campus, occupancy rates suggest softening of market and diminished opportunity for new P3 for construction
- Master leases of private apartment buildings allow more flexibility as demand and stock change over time
University Housing:

THE NEXT 25 YEARS
Enrollment Strategy

- Anticipated growth in undergraduate class from 30,500 to 32,000-33,000
  - First-year class grows to 5,800-6,000
  - Fall transfer class grows to 2,250
  - Possible growth in:
    - College of Biological Science
    - College of Science and Engineering
    - Carlson School of Management
    - College of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource Sciences

- Housing scholarship fund
## Retention and Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in U Housing</th>
<th>1st-to-2nd Year Retention</th>
<th>2nd-to-3rd Year Retention</th>
<th>4-Year Grad Rate</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>85-86%</td>
<td>76-78%</td>
<td>45-48%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91-92%</td>
<td>80-82%</td>
<td>59-61%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89-91%</td>
<td>64-68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT CONCEPT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

30 year vision
Riverfront Housing Neighborhood

- Achieves connectivity and neighborhood goals for both housing and the academic health sciences
- Meets expected enrollment growth to provide residence hall experience to first-year students
- Provides guidance on future maintenance and renovation investments
What Might Be Different?

- Style of room configuration in new construction will evolve, but will remain residence hall format
- Near-campus apartment stock will age
- Enrollment targets will change
Balancing Vision with Affordability

- Analysis of rates provides guidance on pace of investments in University-owned housing
- Evaluating implications of moving from lowest to midpoint of the Big Ten for room rates
- Riverfront Neighborhood plan requires remaining residence halls be maintained to a high quality for an expected 30-50 years or more to maintain affordability
DISCUSSION

University Housing:
AGENDA ITEM: Optimizing Physical Assets: Network Infrastructure Refresh and Issues Related to Cybersecurity

☐Review ☐Review + Action ☐Action ☒Discussion

☒ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Bernard Gulachek, Interim Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Brian Dahlin, Chief Information Security Officer
Kemal Badur, Senior Director, OIT Infrastructure and Operations

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is to inform the Board of anticipated network infrastructure upgrades. When detail on scope, schedule, and budget are available, the Board will be asked to review and approve components of the project, estimated at roughly $78 million, beginning in FY 2017.

The University’s data network infrastructure is a utility as critical to University operations and its mission as any other. Like electrical, water, and heating/cooling utilities, it requires ongoing reinvestment to ensure reliability and security. The present system-wide network was installed in 2004 (Wi-Fi technology installed in 2008) and designed for an expected 5- to 7-year life cycle. That network will reach the end of its useful life in late 2017. While short-term strategies for managing or mitigating these circumstances exist, new wired and Wi-Fi technology will be required to operationally and sustainably support the University’s mission. Specifically:

- Most components are no longer available to purchase new.
- Software and application support for two major components, firewalls and primary routing modules, has expired.
- Manufacturer support for the Wi-Fi network ends in November 2017.
- Manufacturer support for the rest of the wired network expires in January 2018.

The system-wide network is comprised of several components or major system layers that will be replaced or redesigned as part of this project. These components are:

- Network Core Routing
- Network Distribution and Edge Switching
- Data Center Network
- WiFi Network
- Firewall and Security Infrastructure
Understanding Demand

The research and educational missions of the University provide unique network needs. Academically, the University’s network must be able to support interactive and technology-rich classrooms and provide consistent student access. Research traffic must integrate with the Gopher Science Network to efficiently move large datasets and manage data-collection points. Demand is increasing more broadly for the management of simple devices, known as the “Internet Of Things,” that are tools for the educational mission and system automation. The new network should anticipate future needs as much as possible - supporting emerging technologies such as IPv6, roaming IP, access strategies for end users such as 802.1X, as well as devices that cannot use 802.1X but need secure reliable network access.

Cybersecurity

Network security (protecting the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information) and assurance (ensuring availability, integrity, authentication, and confidentiality) is core to managing a data network, and this is an aspect of the network that has grown enormously in importance and sophistication. Data at the University includes both highly sensitive research data as well as private, personal data. Examples of the type of data in the University’s network include: students’ and employees’ personal information such as social security numbers, addresses, and phone numbers; private health records; and extensive research data from a variety of disciplines.

The network upgrade will provide additional tools to analyze and identify data in order to mitigate evolving security threats and protect University intellectual and private data. The network must have the capability to adapt as these threats pose increasing challenges to the University. Investments in security management tools that match the level of threat sophistication are needed to ensure continuous operations and to comply to an increasingly growing list of regulatory requirements.

The Board of Regents approved the 2016 State Supplemental Request in December 2015, which included $19 million to address this component of the network upgrade. Of the $19 million requested, approximately $10 million will be used for hardware/equipment and $9 million for software. The cybersecurity work will be broken down into three main technical areas of improvement: 1) security firewalls; 2) security intrusion, detection, denial of service, and threat monitoring/logging; and 3) security management, monitoring, and operations.

Evolving Technology

A new network is expected to provide a base service of 1 gigabit to all locations, with the ability to deliver 2.5, 5, 10, 40, and 100 gigabit connections where needed. It should support Power Over Ethernet and IP Quality of Service (QOS) to protect sensitive data such as video and voice. A new WiFi system should be capable of supporting the latest technology, must be able to stay ahead of the forecasted 20% annual growth in devices and number of connections, and must perform as a viable replacement for general wired connections including the capacity to support real-time voice and video applications. In University housing, the new system will transition to a “hospitality type” solution to improve service to students and better utilize existing infrastructure and optimize capacity.
Components Involved

- **Network Core Routers (quantity: 28)** *End of Support: 01/2018*
  Core Routers are the heart of the campus network. These devices are interconnected with diverse 10-gigabit fiber paths. The core routers provide connectivity from building distribution centers to the other areas of the campus, Internet and research networks, and the Data Center Network.

- **Network Distribution Switches (quantity: ~430)** *End of Support: 01/2018*
  These electronic devices generally reside in the basement Main Distribution Room (MDR) of each building. They typically connect to the closest Core Router by at least two non-diverse 1-gigabit fiber links. In turn, these provide connectivity via fiber to Edge Switches typically located on each floor of a building.

- **Network Edge Switches (quantity: ~2,780)** *End of Support: 01/2018*
  These switches are in over 1,200 equipment closets alongside copper cabling infrastructure for that portion of the building and connected to station wire cabling that is used to connect an end-user’s computer. The University’s nearly 7,000 Wi-Fi access points (APs) are also connected through these cables and switch ports. An important goal of the RFP process is to expose new platforms that may be ready (or nearly ready) for production. Our current network has close to 100,000 available ports, but we are only using approximately 65,000 of these. This number has been fairly stable over the last several years, due to the increased usage of Wi-Fi. There is an option to reduce the number of switches based on the number of network ports in use which would save the project significant initial costs.

- **Data Center Network (quantity: included above)** *End of Support: 01/2018*
  The Data Center network is built using the same technology as the core and edge. Special attention to redundancy and diversity for fault tolerance was built-in. Over time, minor augmentation and upgrades have been performed but the Data Center network is subject to the same end of support as the rest of the network. New Data Center technologies will drive a different architecture as the University’s core enterprise systems and supporting technical infrastructure reside in this center, requiring greater speed and resilience and stronger security capabilities.

- **Wi-Fi Network (quantity: ~7,000)** *End of Support: 11/2017*
  The University Wi-Fi network consists of nearly 7,000 access points (APs) and 40 controllers, and was built as an overlay on the wired network starting in 2008. Since then, WiFi usage and coverage demand have dramatically increased. An upgrade will address the need for enhanced performance and gain the ability to more effectively manage and simplify the end user experience, allowing better support for a wider range of wireless devices. WiFi usage continues to grow at a very high rate and should be considered a mission critical service for most University functions. New systems are capable of delivering better than gigabit performance to the user, and are expected to provide increased capacity.

- **Firewall and Security Infrastructure (quantity: included above)** *End of Support: 9/2015-1/2018*
  Current firewalls that reside in the core routers have reached end-of-support and will need to be replaced with the core network. Security sensing and detection capabilities must concomitantly advance as the network does. For example, if the selected network backbone speed is 100 gigabit, the Security infrastructure must be able to gather and analyze data at that rate. Security, threat mitigation, and compliance are increasingly important. An upgraded network must include the following capabilities: advanced sensors that will detect and mitigate service-disrupting traffic, reducing the risk of the Distributed Denial of Service or “DDoS”
attacks; advanced data center security to enable the segmentation of mission-critical servers into areas of increased protection; and Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS) to enable increased visibility of server-to-server traffic within the network.

**Decision-Making Process**

A competitive purchasing process is underway that will provide the University with a precise and detailed understanding of the solutions and associated costs for data network and associated information security technologies. This process will also provide insight to emerging technologies that have not yet reached market, but may emerge to extend the useful life of this next major investment. An assessment was performed by an external consulting firm in early 2014 to survey manufacturers and vendors to calculate budgetary costs for a network replacement. Pre-competitive estimates for replacing the University system’s data network and associated security components is roughly $78 million. When further clarity regarding scope, schedule, and budget are available, the Board will be asked to review and approve components of the project beginning in FY2017.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Board of Regents have received the following briefings related to information technology planning and investment:

- December 2015: 2016 State Supplemental Request (BOR)
- June 2015: IT Capital Planning (FAC)
Optimizing our Physical Assets:
IT Network Infrastructure Refresh and
Issues Related to Cybersecurity
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Overview and Context

RIGHT-SIZED TO MEET NEEDS

STABLE

SECURE
Goal: Meet Changing Needs

Usage Requirements

- Increase speed and throughput capacity
- Increase wireless access
- Increase security management
## Why Upgrade Now?
Keep up with Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October 2010</th>
<th>October 2015</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Unique Users</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Unique Users</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>190%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Devices</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Sessions</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>667%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Devices on Network</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed to the Desktop</td>
<td>Max 1GB</td>
<td>Max 1GB</td>
<td>Max 100GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth to the Internet</td>
<td>2GB</td>
<td>10GB</td>
<td>&gt;200 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi Coverage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modem Lines</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center Speed</td>
<td>1GB</td>
<td>10GB</td>
<td>100GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Speed</td>
<td>10MB</td>
<td>600MB</td>
<td>1.3GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Devices accessing the UMN WiFi network each day have doubled since 2010.

2010: 40,000 devices per day

2015: 80,000 devices per day
Usage Trends in Higher Education

• Mobile technology is ubiquitous in the lives of today's college students. 95% of students owned a smartphone as of last year, and more than half (57%) owned a tablet.

• Some survey data shows that 50% of students reported that they do schoolwork daily from smartphones or tablets.

Source: EDUCAUSE Review Students' Mobile Learning Practices in Higher Education: A Multi-Year Study
Usage Trends in Research

- Twenty-first century research is more data-intensive than ever due to the proliferation of digital technologies and the demand for answers in today’s era of fast-paced innovation.
- The movement toward collaborative (aka “open”) innovation is affecting scientific research, bringing scientists from different disciplines together in their pursuit of solutions to today’s challenges.
- Researchers from numerous disciplines need to work together to attack complex problems; openly sharing data will pave the way for researchers to communicate and collaborate more effectively.

Stability and Reliability Requirements

- The appropriate level of redundancy for inevitable hardware failures
- Upgrade building and infrastructure capability to prepare for growing WiFi demand
- Latest network technology available
Aging Equipment

- Components on our network are showing their age
- At their maximum capacity
- Several components are nearing end of life
Goal: Security

Ensure security with advanced infrastructure

- Advanced intrusion detection
- Advanced denial of service attack defense
- Advanced firewalls for the data center
- Appropriately-sized firewalls for the general access network
- Advanced logging and security monitoring
Ensure security with advanced infrastructure

- **Denial of Service (DoS) Protection.** Malicious attackers are increasingly trying to "take-down" networks via Denial of Service attacks. The new network will contain advanced sensors that will detect and mitigate service disrupting traffic reducing the risk of such attacks.

- **Advanced Data Center Security.** Attackers frequently pivot from devices on the broad network to gain remote access to servers running in the data centers. The new network will enable the segmentation of mission critical servers into areas of increased protection.

- **Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS).** The new network will have increased visibility of server to server traffic within the network. By deploying a larger array of optical taps, we will be able to deploy equipment, ad-hoc, to investigate specific security incidents.
## Network Cost Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Estimated Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Routers - 100 Gig interconnect</td>
<td>$23,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center Network 100 Gig - Core, Spine, Leaf</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution / Edge</td>
<td>$21,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi - TC</td>
<td>$5,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Campus / Distribution Edge / WiFi</td>
<td>$5,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Infrastructure Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,890,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security subtotal (see slide 14)</td>
<td><strong>$19,075,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,965,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Data Security Cost Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Firewalls</th>
<th>$9,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Intrusion Detection, Denial of Service, Threat Monitoring / Logging systems &amp; tools</td>
<td>$8,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management, Monitoring, Operations</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,075,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Network Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT NETWORK</th>
<th>NEXT GENERATION NETWORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Limited security controls</td>
<td>• Improved security infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-redundant core routers for system campuses - Morris, RCH</td>
<td>• Redundant core routers for system campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 gigabit interconnect</td>
<td>• 100 gigabit interconnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 gigabit data center</td>
<td>• 100 gigabit data center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100,000 total network ports</td>
<td>• 70,000 active and in-use only network ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18 TC core routers</td>
<td>• 12 TC core routers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6,800 WiFi AP’s</td>
<td>• 7,000 WiFi AP’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION
AGENDA ITEM:  Real Estate Transactions

☐ Review   ☑ Review + Action   ☐ Action   ☐ Discussion

☐ This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS:  Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services
             Susan Carlson Weinberg, Director of Real Estate

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

The purpose of this item is two-fold: Take action to approve a real estate transaction brought to the committee in December 2015 for review (A, below); and to review and take action on a second real estate transaction (B, below).

In accordance with Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, take action to approve the following real estate transaction:

A. Amendment to Phased Aggregate Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC covering 1,722 Acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County (UMore Park)

The proposed amendment to the Dakota Aggregates’ phased aggregate mining lease will delay mining on certain parcels in Empire Township included in the leased premises to allow continued use by the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences for agricultural research purposes, extend the lease term by 20 years, and modify the Initial Advanced Minimum Royalty amounts related to the delayed mining. Additional details of this transaction and its financial impact are described in the transaction information pages.

In accordance with Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, review and take action to approve the following real estate transaction:

B. Sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County (Cloquet Forestry Center)

Daniel and Gina Brethorst have requested purchase of the subject property for a sum of $7,400 plus closing costs, with closing to occur immediately after the February 2016 Board of Regents’ meetings.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Board of Regents Policy: *Reservation and Delegation of Authority* states that “The Board reserves to itself authority to approve the purchase or sale of real property with a value greater than $1,250,000, or larger than ten (10) acres,” and “leases of real property, easements, and other interests in real property if the initial term amount to be paid by or to the University exceeds $1,250,000, consistent with Board policies.”

A. Amendment to Phased Aggregate Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC covering 1,722 Acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County (UMore Park)

In February 2015 the Board of Regents approved a resolution related to reorganization of the UMore Park Development Project. Information provided included an update on gravel mining and UMore Park planning activities, as well as analyses of the University’s interests in UMore Park related to agricultural research, remediating contaminated property, its role in development activities and costs, and management and oversight roles, with a recommendation to enter into discussions with Dakota Aggregates on a longer moratorium on mining on certain plots.

In November 2010 the Board of Regents approved a 40-year lease to Dakota Aggregates, Inc. for phased aggregate mining of 1,722 acres, Dakota (UMore Park).

B. Sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County (Cloquet Forestry Center)

In May 2002, the Board of Regents reviewed the planned sale of a number of parcels of land totaling 475 acres assigned to the Cloquet Forestry Center, one of which is the subject property.

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends approval of the following real estate transactions:

A. Amendment to Phased Aggregate Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC covering 1,722 Acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County (UMore Park)

B. Sale of 36.87 Acres, Carlton County (Cloquet Forestry Center)
Real Estate Transactions
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Empire Township Operations & Phasing Plan
Amendment to Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC
Phase Mining of 1,722 Acres, Dakota County, UMore Park
AMENDMENT TO PHASED AGGREGATE MINING LEASE WITH DAKOTA AGGREGATES, LLC COVERING 1,722 ACRES IN ROSEMOUNT AND EMPIRE TOWNSHIP, DAKOTA COUNTY (UMORE PARK)

1. Recommended Action

The President recommends the appropriate administrative officers receive authorization to execute an amendment to the lease granted to Dakota Aggregates, LLC for its phased aggregate mining on the 1,722 acres in Rosemount and Empire Township, Dakota County.

2. Description of Leased Premises

The subject 1,722 acres are located in the City of Rosemount and Empire Township in Dakota County. The leased premises generally cover the westerly 1/3 of the UMore Park property. See attached map.

3. Background and Basis for Request

The University entered into a lease covering 1,722 acres for phased aggregate mining by Dakota Aggregates, LLC on June 8, 2011. The lease grants to Dakota Aggregates rights for the use of up to 160 acres at any one time for mining, processing, and stockpiling of aggregate, sand, gravel, and other materials over a period of approximately 40 years, plus land for its plant facility, 190 acres. Activities on the leased premises in preparation for mining began in the fall of 2011. The University has retained its rights to use the portions of the leased premises which are not permitted for aggregate mining by the City of Rosemount or Empire Township. Dakota Aggregates, LLC anticipates obtaining necessary permits to commence mining activities on the Empire Township Property in the fall of 2017.

The first amendment to the lease was executed in 2013 and memorialized the lease commencement date of May 17, 2013 and modified the Annual Minimum Royalty due in the first Lease Year. A letter agreement in 2014 provided for limited changes to the Operations Plan.

The University now desires to retain the use of certain portions of the leased premises in Empire Township for agricultural research purposes beyond the dates anticipated when the 2011 lease and previous amendment and letter agreement were executed, and in exchange, Dakota Aggregates has requested a 20-year extension of the lease to provide additional time for completion of its mining activities in Empire Township.

4. Details of Transaction

The second amendment to the Dakota Aggregates lease will modify the June 8, 2011 lease as follows:
A. The Lease Term for the mining in Empire Township will be extended Twenty (20) years, expiring on June 30, 2073.

B. The Operations Plan and accompanying Phasing schedule for the Empire Township property will be revised to delay mining of portions of the leased premises located in Empire Township as follows: to 2017 for 166.10 acres (including portable asphalt plant location); to 2030 for 301.34 acres; and to 2040 for 240.12 acres.

C. The Initial Advanced Minimum Royalty amounts of $1,150,000 and $500,000 to be paid by Dakota Aggregates shall be revised as follows:
   i. $387,750 on the earlier of September 1, 2017 or issuance of the Mining Permits for the Empire Township Property;
   ii. $112,250 on the earlier of April 1, 2030 or issuance of the Mining Permits for the Empire Township Property;
   iii. $518,875 on or before April 1, 2030 if the Mining Permits for the Empire Township Property have been issued; and
   iv. $631,125 on or before April 1, 2040 if the Mining Permits for the Empire Township Property have been issued.

D. Base royalty adjustments will be made every 5 years by escalator, agreement or arbitration for Lease Years 11 through 60.

E. The University's use of the Rosemount Research and Outreach Center Administration Building, located within the 1,722-acre leased premises, will end December 31, 2016.

F. The Dakota Aggregates and University annual meeting will occur in October (rather than the spring) of each Lease Year.

7. Recommendations

The above-described real estate transaction is appropriate:

Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Richard H. Pfutzenreuter III, Vice President for Finance and CFO

Pamela Wheelock, Vice President for University Services
This map is intended to be used for planning purposes only and should not be relied upon where a survey is required.

Base Data: Real Estate Office
Dakota County, U-Services Enterprise GIS
11/24/2015

Lease to Dakota Aggregates, Inc. for Aggregate Mining at Umore Park
Empire Township Operations & Phasing Plan
Amendment to Mining Lease with Dakota Aggregates, LLC
Phase Mining of 1,722 Acres, Dakota County, UMore Park

This map is intended to be used for planning purposes only and should not be relied upon where a survey is required.

11/10/2015
SALE OF 36.87 ACRES, CARLTON COUNTY
(CLOQUET FORESTRY CENTER)

1. Recommended Action

The President recommends that the appropriate administrative officers receive authorization to execute the appropriate documents providing for the sale of 36.87 acres of land in Carlton County to Daniel and Gina Brethorst.

2. Location and Description of the Property

The subject property consists of 36.87 acres of vacant land. The property is located approximately three (3) miles east of the Cloquet Forestry Center (see attached map). The property is low, wet ground with no road access and a railroad track cutting through the western part of the property.

The legal description of the property to be conveyed is as follows:

Part of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, Section 1, Township 48 North, Range 17 West, Carlton County, Minnesota;

Except minerals and mineral rights.

3. Background and Basis for the Request

In May 2002, the Board of Regents reviewed a plan to offer for sale a number of parcels assigned to the Cloquet Forestry Center located in Carlton and Lake of the Woods Counties totaling 475 acres. The properties were then offered for sale to the State of Minnesota, and the county and municipality or township within which the property is located. As a result of that offering, Carlton County purchased 123.64 acres. The remaining parcels were then offered for sale by public bid.

The subject property is one of three parcels that remained unsold following the public bid offering. These three parcels have been marketed since that time on the University’s Real Estate Office website at www.realestate.umn.edu.

The buyers, Danial and Gina Brethorst, recently offered to purchase the property for the advertised price.

4. Details of Transaction

The sale price is $7,400, with the buyers paying all closing costs to complete the transaction. The buyers, Daniel and Gina Brethorst, have requested that closing occur immediately after the February 2016 Board of Regents’ meetings.
5. Use of Proceeds

The net proceeds from the sale of the property will be deposited to the Real Estate Acquisition Account for use by the Cloquet Forestry Center for the future purchase of real estate or other capital assets consistent with the University's Strategic Planning initiatives.

6. Recommendations

The above-described real estate transaction is appropriate:

Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Richard H. Pfutzenreuter III, Vice President for Finance and CFO

Pamela Wheelock, Vice President for University Services
Sale of 36.87 Acres in Carlton County

Cloquet Forestry Center
Facilities, Planning & Operations

February 11, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: Information Items

☐ Review  ☐ Review + Action  ☐ Action  ☒ Discussion

This is a report required by Board policy.

PRESENTERS: Pamela Wheelock, Vice President, University Services

PURPOSE & KEY POINTS

To provide an update on the following information items:

- Annual Update on Sustainability Efforts in Facilities, Planning, and Operations
- Final Project Review: Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab (West Central ROC)
- Final Project Review: Bell Museum (Twin Cities Campus)
- 2015 State Capital Appropriations Report

Information items are intended to provide the Board with information needed for them to provide their oversight responsibilities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Annual Update on Sustainability Efforts in Facilities, Planning, and Operations

Board of Regents Policy: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency states, “The University is committed to incorporating sustainability into its teaching, research, and outreach and the operations that support them.” This report updates the Board on progress in achieving this objective in operations-related functions over the past 12 months.

The policy directs each campus to set specific sustainability objectives and targets, and report on them annually. To this end, earlier this academic year the University integrated existing commitments and goals related to greenhouse gas emissions mitigation by including a Greenhouse Gas measure and target on the University Progress Card. In addition, each campus has been advancing operations sustainability in the following areas:

- Food – University research and instruction is deeply involved in the development of sustainable food systems. Students, faculty, and staff are implementing lessons from the classroom, the lab, and the field to transform and make our campus food systems more sustainable. In the past
year, campus communities grew and harvested over 50,000 pounds of produce for use in on-campus dining.

- **Waste** – Use of products at the end of their life is an important strategy for resource conservation and sustainability. This year, campus waste management programs continued to divert more than 40% of waste to recycling and composting. In addition, students demonstrated a strong interest in preventing food waste and in composting more food waste, which contributed to over 9,500 pounds of food being donated from campus dining facilities to local food shelves and hunger prevention.

- **Water** – The amount of water used and the way it is used directly affects the sustainability of the University. Campuses utilized their hydration stations to encourage reusable water bottles, resulting in over 5,000,000 refills. This reduced waste associated with disposable, single-use plastic water bottles.

- **Energy** – The energy resources supporting teaching, research, and outreach are the primary contributor to the carbon footprint for the majority of the University’s campuses and sites. Therefore, how the University creates the power that supports progress and discovery and how much energy the institution consumes are core component of operations sustainability efforts. Over the last year, campuses continued to emphasize energy efficiency and took steps to increase the amount of energy provided to campus from renewable sources. New wind turbines, solar arrays, and a combined heat and power plant were brought online or began construction this year.

- **Transportation** – How people get to and around campus affects a number of sustainability dimensions, including carbon footprint, resource consumption, and personal wellness. Over the past year, efforts advanced to make transportation systems more sustainable, with improvements to cycling systems and the addition of incentives to promote sustainable transportation methods. In addition, the sustainability of the University’s vehicle fleet continues to advance, with over 64% of the campus fleet now electric, hybrid-electric, or E-85 fueled.

- **Buildings** – How facilities are constructed and operated today significantly affects the sustainability of the institution, immediately and for decades to come given the longevity and durability of the built environment. The University is committed to applying sustainable building standards, which encourage choices for healthy indoor air, purchase of local materials, and features that reduce resource consumption and lifecycle impacts for the building. The University now has multiple buildings that have either been LEED-certified or meet the requirements of the state’s sustainable building program.

These themes are aligned with the guiding principles and implementation objectives outlined in Board of Regents Policy: *Sustainability and Energy Efficiency*. The report included in the docket, prepared by student employees in the Office of Sustainability, takes an innovative approach to provide the Board and the community additional information on accomplishments and activities in the aforementioned areas.
Final Project Review: Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab (West Central ROC)

The Minnesota Poultry Testing Laboratory is located in Willmar. 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. The existing building will be repurposed for offices, conference rooms, shipping and receiving, and support space. Site improvements include a new loading dock area and parking.

Final Project Review: Bell Museum (Twin Cities Campus)

The new Bell Museum project is located on a five-acre site on the southwest corner of Larpenteur and Cleveland Avenues in St. Paul. The new 92,000 gross square foot facility replaces the existing antiquated Bell Museum in Minneapolis.

2015 State Capital Appropriations Report

Minnesota Statute 135A.05 requires a report of expenditures on capital projects paid for in the preceding calendar year. This report is due to the commissioner of management and budget by January 15. The report was submitted to the Board for comment prior to submission. University Services did not receive any Regent feedback.
Rochester decreases carbon footprint by increasing prairie space

Land purchased by the University of Minnesota Rochester has been revitalized. Asphalt and concrete were removed in this 2015 project. The plot was planted with native prairie grasses, Dogwood shrubs, and Aspen trees. This project decreases the city’s carbon footprint, minimizes water run off and adds beauty to Rochester.

University of Minnesota Morris receives the very first Green Ribbon Schools Post-Secondary award

University of Minnesota Morris receives the very first Green Ribbon Schools Post-Secondary honoree award. This award is given based on reduced environmental impact and costs, improved health and wellness, and effective environmental and sustainability education.

The UMD Land Lab partnership with UMD Dining supplies student-grown, healthy food to campus

The University of Minnesota Duluth works hard to bring fresh and locally grown food to the table. This year, Duluth’s Dining Services partnered with the University of Minnesota Land Lab to promote that goal.

Crookston harvests 11,000 pounds of food

In 2014, the community garden produced a harvest of 6,500 pounds, and this year the harvest nearly doubled. 11,000 pounds of food was harvested from the garden this year. This food was then used by Sodexo, who provides dining services for Crookston.
The Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) held its annual conference in Minneapolis October 25th to 28th, 2015. The conference was held during the 10th anniversary of the AASHE organization and the first to be held in the Upper Midwest, this conference provided an opportunity for the University of Minnesota to showcase the breadth and depth of sustainability work to an international audience. Sustainability Director at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities, Shane Stennes, along with Beth Mercer-Taylor, Sustainability Education Coordinator at the Institute on the Environment, attended and introduced at this year’s AASHE conference, shown to the left.

Relationships built within the context of the AASHE Host Committee helped build connections between the University of Minnesota Twin Cities and other higher education institutions, particularly those involved in a Hennepin County Green Partners grant. Planning for the four day conference was done with support from a Host Committee made up of representatives from higher education institutions in the Upper Midwest. University of Minnesota staff, students, and faculty provided critical leadership to the committee and helped to highlight unique, local sustainability successes through the conference proceedings. The Host Committee was also a catalyst for building relationships between the University of Minnesota Twin Cities and other higher education institutions that have had positive impacts beyond the conference.

The location of the AASHE conference in Minneapolis offered participants a unique opportunity to select from over 400 sessions offered across the three days without expensive travel costs often associated with a national conference. Participants selected from engagement, operations, curriculum, planning & administration, research and art tracks in a wide variety of sustainability-related topics, such as energy, finance, climate mitigation & adaption, and public engagement. Eighty-six University of Minnesota staff, students, faculty members and partners presented in various session formats throughout the conference. AASHE was described by one of the University of Minnesota staff members as “a chance to brainstorm, network and problem solve with leaders.” A total of 173 individuals associated with the U of M attended this year’s conference.
In the spring and summer of 2015, University of Minnesota Rochester completed a project that not only added aesthetic beauty to Rochester, but made a positive impact on the environment. The University had purchased land at 701 and 617 S. Broadway in 2009, located right in the heart of downtown Rochester. Before purchasing, the land was used as a surface parking lot for restaurants, but the University has larger vision for the site. Eventually, the site will host development to support the campus and in the meantime, it was planted as a prairie.

The project began with removal of deteriorating asphalt and concrete. These impervious surfaces had previously allowed rainwater to run off of them, resulting in more water and pollutants entering the local watershed. After the removal of these surfaces, Rochester seeded it with natural plantings. Some of these plantings include: native prairie grasses, Dogwood shrubs, and Aspen trees.

Facilities and Operations Coordinator at Rochester, Barry Standorf, is proud of this project, stating that it “decreased the carbon footprint in the downtown area and decreased the amount of surface water runoff.”
FOOD

Duluth Students Show Their Green Thumb

During 2015, the Sustainable Agriculture Project supplied over 30,000 pounds of produce and pumpkins to UMD, all grown by students, using organic methods. The Sustainable Agriculture Project (SAP) was founded in 2009 to promote research, teaching and public engagement around sustainability in food, water, energy and biodiversity within a landscape scale ‘land lab’. The SAP collaborates with researchers from the humanities, social sciences, the natural sciences and engineering on solutions-oriented action research projects.

Crookston: Local Foods Are Golden

Crookston harvested over 11,000 pounds of food this year from their local garden. This food was harvested and then prepared and served by Dining Services. This focus on local food is driving a sustainable approach to dining on the Crookston Campus. The Crookston Students for Sustainable Development (CSSD) created a new cooking class available to Crookston students that focused on preparation techniques for local foods. As many Crookston students are unaware of how to prepare and cook local foods, this class provided an opportunity to learn about the local foods available as well as prepare them. The class featured basic preparation techniques for potatoes and squash and taught students how to prepare Venison and round steak using simple ingredients like garlic and olive oil.

How much food did we grow?

Across the state, campuses harvested over 53,000 pounds of local food this year. This is equal to the weight of about 10 elephants!

Morris harvests over 2,400 pounds of food, uses in dining services

Morris is changing the way food enters and leaves their dining services, from source to disposal. The Student Organic Gardening Club has many student led gardens around campus, which include fruits, vegetables and herbs. This year, they harvested over 2,400 pounds of food. This food was used by the campus food service, and also shared with the Community Meals Program. This program focuses on creating a welcoming and warm environment for the community to eat, collaborate and build relationships.

Food Management Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Harvested food (lbs/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twin Cities</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food Waste All-Star Team, Twin Cities University Dining Services (UDS) and the Food Recovery Network, Expand Efforts

In 2014, Twin Cities University Dining Services (UDS) partnered with the Food Recovery Network recovering food from the Coffman Memorial Union Minnesota Marketplace. In 2015, the team expanded their reach to even more UDS restaurants including the Carlson Food Court, the Residential Restaurants and TCF Bank Stadium. To date, this partnership successfully recovered over 9,500 pounds of food which was distributed to the community through other program partners such as Urban Ventures and Loaves and Fishes. Food that was unable to be donated was composted through the University’s organics collection program.

Crookston reduces waste while recycling

Chancellor Fred Wood and students at a refill station with their CSSD bottles made of recycled materials

Crookston has found a way to promote sustainable water consumption while reducing waste. All first year students at the Crookston campus receive water bottles made of recycled materials. The Crookston Students for Sustainable Development provides these water bottles, which are funded through a Green Fee paid by on campus students.

IT’S A WHALE OF A TALE

Morris has composted over 250,000 pounds of food scraps from 2012-2015.

That is equal to the weight of a Blue Whale.
Crookston Garden reaches new heights

A raingarden in front of Heritage Hall, on the University of Minnesota Crookston campus, grew beautifully this spring. The garden's vegetation began to bud, blossom and bloom this year, lending a helping hand to stormwater management on campus. Raingardens act as permeable surfaces that allow stormwater to infiltrate and decreases the amount of water sent to stormwater management systems. This particular raingarden is managing about 2% of all rainwater that falls on the Crookston campus.

The water here is SUPERIOR!

The Duluth campus is taking time to appreciate their water and reduce use. In March, the campus celebrated World Water Day, and took the time to appreciate tap water while also working together to find ways to decrease pollution in Lake Superior. They also work to use natural plantings that both enhance the campus and require less water. The plants added are both native and adopted, and add a "wild" flare to the Duluth campus.

747,000 gallons of water reused at 17th Ave. Residence Hall

The rainwater collection system found on the top of 17th Avenue residence hall has been working hard this year. The Twin Cities newest residence hall has collected and reused 747,000 gallons of water in 2015. The water is collected on the roof and filtered. The green and white roof of the building not only captures water for reuse and to reduce stormwater runoff, but they also reduce the urban heat island effect in the Twin Cities. After filtration, the water is used as the primary water source for the toilet flushing system. The hall also uses high efficiency plumbing systems to reduce water use further.
ENERGY

70% of Morris Electricity from Renewable Sources

Morris is leading the way in renewable energy use. This year alone, 70% of the electricity the campus used came from renewable sources. It received 62% of its electricity from two 1.65MW wind turbines, located directly on campus. In addition, about 16% of the electricity from the local utility is wind power, which brings the Morris total to 70% renewable. For an even greater impact on energy use, the campus has 23kW of installed solar PV systems, which deliver over 30,000 kWh per year. That amount of energy could supply three homes with all their electricity needs for a full year.

Coming soon... Combined Heat and Power Plant

The Twin Cities will unveil their new Combined Heat and Power Plant this year, which will cover the majority of steam needs for the Minneapolis campuses. This plant is a “major tactic in the goal of reducing the University’s carbon emissions by 50 percent by 2020”, said Shane Stennes, who serves as the Director of Sustainability at the University. He continues that “The carbon reduction is partly due to a change in fuel but mostly a result of increased efficiency,” He also added that the ability to use the waste heat from the electricity generation is the real reason the University will see carbon emissions plummet.

Another benefit of the combined heat and power plant is the improved air quality on the Twin Cities campus. The plant produces far less emissions than the previous system. The new system provides large cost savings and increased efficiency as well. In a conventional system, there is about a 49% efficiency rate. With the combined heat and power plant, efficiency rises to 75%.

UMD launches Small Wind Research Project

Dedicated on Earth Day 2015, the UMD Small Wind Research project was installed in the middle of the UMD Land Lab. Led by Mechanical Engineering faculty, Alison Hoxie. A new, Zero-Contact Technology wind turbine is being tested and commissioned. Students from engineering, biology, environment and sustainability played important roles in planning and implementing the project. The wind resource in the heart of the Sustainable Agriculture Project site provided an ideal place to put the technology to the test, as it was designed for marginal wind sites. The project is studying how small wind can better perform in gusty wind conditions.

Duluth campus Energy Levels Up, Saving Energy in the Process

Another chilled water line was added to the Duluth campus to better serve the northern side. The chiller pods on the northern side of campus are the most efficient units. The new chilled water line allows the campus to fire-up the most energy-efficient air conditioning units first. The new line was “directionally-bored”, reducing soil disturbance and erosion during construction. The steam line that runs underground from the heating plant to the Sports and Health building was replaced this year. Crews removed the old steam line—which was having issues with water leaking into the line—and once the entire line was removed, was replaced with a brand new pipe that has double the insulation.

Crookston raises the roof! (For renewable energy)

Crookston received a grant from Otter Tail Power Company to install an 18 kW photovoltaic array on the roof of the Wellness Center that is currently under construction. This system will provide part of the power necessary to run the building. There is a learning component written into the grant; to comply with this one of the panels will be installed at ground level and will include a plaque with information about the system. Inside the building there will be a monitor so building occupants can see the production and consumption in real time.
TRANSPORTATION

U of M Twin Cities goes platinum!

The Twin Cities campus has received the platinum award from The League of American Bicyclists. This award program provides a clear roadmap to building a Bicycle Friendly University and the application has become a rigorous and educational tool. “The University of Minnesota is thrilled and honored to receive this award,” said Steve Sanders, Parking and Transportation Services’ alternative transportation manager. “Moving up from our previous Gold designation to Platinum status is exciting for us. Our biking community grows annually and we do our best to respond in kind and to serve their needs. Our population really takes advantage of our amenities, including our on-campus bike center and ZAP! programs.” The University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus is the third largest traffic generator in Minnesota. The U of M’s Parking and Transportation Services department is committed to establishing, maintaining and improving a comprehensive transportation system that reduces congestion, eases accessibility and enhances a friendly university community.

Transportation & U

Systemwide statistics:
- 1,035,000 miles biked
- 64% Green Fleet in Twin Cities
- 40% of Morris vehicles are electric hybrid

Solar powered parking meters save waste and provide convenience in Duluth

The new parking meters installed across campus are solar-powered with a battery backup. Not only are they more convenient for campus visitors, as they accept credit/debit cards, but the Parking and Transportation Office will go through substantially fewer disposable batteries, all thanks to the power of the sun.

Morris gets ZAPed

Employees and Students of University of Minnesota Morris have biked over 56,000 miles, as recorded by the ZAP readers around campus. ZAP is a service that tracks and rewards bikers by recording through digital devices around the campus. As bikes pass by, their ID is logged by the ZAP reader, and the biker soon receives benefits such as gift cards and discounted health plan rates. The program also allows users to track their miles, CO2 saved and calories burned.
Welcome to our sustainable properties guide! We can find you the most sustainable property faster!

**HOT PROPERTIES**

**Bruininks Hall**

- Bruininks Hall is the perfect place in the Twin Cities for you and your friends to talk about string theory and astrophysics. Bruininks hall boasts the Energy and Environmental Lighting Award of Excellence, so what other reasons do you need to buy this property?

**TCF Bank Stadium**

- Entertain 52,000 of your closest family and friends in this LEED Silver & commercially zoned fully equipped stadium. Enjoy 7 chef's kitchens in a zero waste facility, located in Minneapolis. You'll be scoring a huge victory with this deal.

**17th Ave. Residence Hall**

- Sleep in a different room every single night, and explore the vegetated roof. Amenities also include high efficiency plumbing and heat recovery mechanical systems. After seeing this place, it definitely won't be 17 on your Twin Cities list.

**Recreation Center**

- There's never been a more perfect place to show off your skills on the rock wall. You'll be climbing to new heights with this state of the art fitness facility located in the Twin Cities.

**Northrop**

- Northrop Auditorium, found at UMTC, includes low flow fixtures and vegetation that decrease energy consumption while you're up there! You'll be ahead and sign (and sing!) on this property today!

**West Central Research & Outreach Center**

- This place boasts all sorts of green amenities: preferred parking for fuel efficient vehicles, ultra low-flow fixtures and solar thermal panels! Be the envy of all your sustainable friends with this progressive property in Morris.

**Welcome Center**

- The name says it all: welcome your family and friends to any party or event in this huge property that has also received the Preservation Award in Sustainability. Located in Morris, MN.

**Green Prairie Community Residence Hall**

- You won't ever have to leave home with apple orchards and edible landscapes right in front of you! Become the ultimate zero waste property owner today, and impress everyone with your home grown meals in Morris!

**Swenson Civil Engineering Building**

- Low flow fixtures, storm water runoff management and a heat recovery system all combine to make this Duluth listing one of a kind. Help engineer our way to a better, sustainable future. Hurry and beat the other scientists to it!

**Bagley Outdoor Classroom**

- Ditch the classroom for the great Duluth outdoors! Built with 100% recycled materials, you'll have a great time teaching your friends and family about the Earth at a low environmental cost.

**Labovitz School of Business & Economics**

- This property is simply illuminating: 90% of the lighting is natural! Learn all about economics and business within a Duluth building that truly lights up savings!

**Life Sciences Renovation**

- Study where we came from, and where we should go in this newly renovated Duluth space updated to double pane, argon filled low e windows and includes a white roof to decrease cooling load.

**Janni Hall**

- Less really is more with this great Duluth property: this hall reduced water usage by 38%, energy use by 22% and uses low VOC materials. Keep up the trend by making an offer today!

**Evergreen Hall**

- Are you ready to get down with recycling? This Crookston hall has carpet with 60% recycled content and ceramic tile with 54% recycled content. You can really party on top of sustainability by making this property yours!

**Heritage Hall**

- Beautiful rain gardens surround this hall in an effort to reduce storm water runoff. Purchase this Crookston listing today and you can help grow the seeds of sustainability!

**Meet our Realtors...**

- **Shane Stennes**
  - Shane is the Director of Sustainability at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities. Helping the Twin Cities be sustainable since 2010

- **Daniel Svedarsky**
  - Daniel resides in Crookston, where he is the Director for Sustainability. Helping you find a sustainable home

- **Mindy Granley**
  - Mindy directs the Office of Sustainability in Duluth. Move sustainably with Mindy

- **Troy Goodnough**
  - The Morris Office of Sustainability is directed by Troy Goodnough. Turning sustainable dreams into reality

- **Barry Standorf**
  - Barry is the Facilities and Operations Coordinator at Rochester. Excess your sustainability expectations!
The University of Minnesota signs the White House Act On Climate Agreement

In November 2015, Eric Kaler, President of the University of Minnesota, signed the White House’s Act on Climate Agreement. Joining hundreds of other higher education leaders, President Kaler affirmed the University’s commitment to address climate change by:

1. Reducing carbon emissions 50% by the end of 2020 through the implementation of combined heat and power and extensive energy efficiency initiatives.
2. Achieving carbon neutrality across all of our campuses by 2050.
3. Preparing students, through our Grand Challenges Curriculum and other educational experiences, to understand the causes and impacts of climate change, to assess interventions to achieve climate neutrality and resilience, and to take action.
4. Marshalling the University’s research and creative capacity to develop sustainable cities and resilient communities, and to provide secure food, water and energy in a carbon constrained world and changing climate.

University of Minnesota Morris receives the very first Green Ribbon Schools Post-Secondary award

The University of Minnesota Morris has become the first post secondary institution to receive the Green Ribbons Schools honor. This award exists to inspire schools to strive for 21st century excellence, by highlighting promising practices and resources that all can employ. The award is given to institutions that show the following:

- Reduce environmental impact and costs;
- Improve the health and wellness of schools, students, and staff; and
- Provide environmental education, which teaches many disciplines, and is especially good at effectively incorporating STEM, civic skills, and green career pathways.

Morris was nominated and received this award for its sustainable practices, including the 32-unit solar thermal array that heats the Fitness Center pool, reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 30,000 pounds each year. Morris also houses two solar photovoltaic systems on campus to convert sunlight into electricity, and generate more than 30,000 kWh annually. A biomass gasifier plant on campus uses local natural resources to heat and cool the campus. The campus builds and renovates in sustainable ways, all which led to receiving this award.
classifieds

accepting reusable materials

Bring your surplus office supplies, furniture, equipment and parts to the ReUse Center!

883 29th Ave. SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414
612-625-6874

wanted sustainability advocates

Are you passionate about sustainability and wanting to expand green programming at the UMTC? Join one of the newest student committees, the MSA Sustainability Committee!

Want your office to be a “green office”?

The Duluth campus is here to help! If you know your office is energy efficient and reduces waste, contact UMD Sustainability. They can tour your office and provide you with a green office label!

Contact UMD Sustainability
sustain@d.umn.edu

need help designing a sustainable project?

The Center for Sustainable Building Research can help! We offer Design for Community Resilience, where students from the College of Design offer solutions and designs that are sustainable and user-focused.

Interested? Contact Richard Strong 612-625-3447

looking for a green energy solution?

The Clean Energy Resource Team (CERT) can help! They are a statewide partnership with a shared mission to connect individuals and their communities to the resources they need to identify and implement community-based clean energy projects.

Visit our website: www.CleanEnergyResourceTeams.org

seeking green ambassadors

U of MN Morris needs you to lead Green tours to visitors and prospective students. Share your interest in sustainability and help others understand sustainable practices at the Morris campus.

Contact Office of Sustainability - Morris
320-589-6303

seeking solutions to earth’s environmental problems

The Institute on the Environment is seeking ideas for agriculture that feeds the world, renewable energy that powers the planet, provides food for every person, cleans water and oceans, creates vibrant economies in cities, neighborhoods and cultures and creates thriving ecosystems that support thriving economies and societies.

Do you have an idea?

Contact the Institute on the Environment
612-624-6973
Dear University of Minnesota...

Q: I want to bike to school, but I don't have a bike on campus. What can I do?
- Mindful in Minneapolis

A: Great question! At the Twin Cities campus, there is a great system called "Nice Ride" that allows you to rent bicycles. There are more than 15 stations you can rent from around the campus, and it costs only $65 a year!
- Goldy Gopher

Q: I want to make a difference on campus, who can I connect with??
- Curious in Crookston

A: There is a great student group called "Crookston Students for Sustainable Development", you should look into that! They research, explore and create concepts for sustainable initiatives for the campus.
- Regal the Eagle

Q: I want to eat locally grown foods, but I can't grow a garden in university housing! What do I do?!
- Munching in Morris

A: Don't worry, Munching. Morris has a Farmers Market every Monday and Thursday through September from 3-6pm! If you stop by the Morris Healthy Eating Booth there, you will get a FREE reusable market tote bag too!
- Pounce the Cougar

Q: I have a great idea on how to increase sustainability on campus. Who do I talk to?
- Discovering in Duluth

A: You should look into the UMD Green Revolving Fund! It strives to reduce the carbon footprint, save money, educate the community about sustainability and increase interdisciplinary connections throughout campus!
- Champ the Bulldog

Q: I want to work out on campus, but there isn't a Rec center! What should I do if I don't want to drive to a gym?
- Restless in Rochester

A: We are so glad you want to decrease your driving! UMR has partnered with the Rochester Area Family YMCA to provide students access to recreational space. Stop into the Student Resource Center to learn more!
- Rockie the Raptor
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MEMORANDUM

January 29, 2016

TO: Regent Dean Johnson, Chair, Board of Regents
   Regent David McMillan, Vice Chair, Board of Regents and Chair, Facilities, Planning, and Operations Committee
   Regent Thomas Devine, Vice Chair, Facilities, Planning, and Operations Committee

FROM: Pamela Wheelock
       Vice President for University Services

RE: Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab Final Project Review

According to Board of Regents Policy Reservation and Delegation of Authority, Article I, Section VIII, Subdivision 10, “The Board reserves to itself the authority for a subsequent review of approved capital budget projects with a value greater than $5,000,000 prior to the award of construction contracts.”

The Minnesota Poultry Testing Lab project currently is within the scope, schedule and budget approved by the Board of Regents. In order to maintain the project scope, schedule, and budget, it is important that the University award the construction contract prior to the next Board of Regents meeting. Therefore, I am requesting your review of this project outside the normal Board of Regents meeting schedule. With the award of this contract, we are committing to complete the project as approved.

We will include the attached Project Summary as part of the information items for the February 11, 2016 Board of Regents Facilities, Planning, and Operations Committee meeting.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

cc: Eric Kaler, President
    Amy Phenix, Chief of Staff
    Brian Steeves, Executive Director and Corporate Secretary, Board of Regents
    Suzanne Smith, Assistant Vice President, Capital Planning and Project Management
Policy Summary:

According to Board of Regents Policy Reservation and Delegation of Authority, Article I, Section VIII, Subdivision 10, “The Board reserves to itself the authority for a subsequent review of approved capital budget projects with a value greater than $5,000,000 prior to the award of construction contracts.”

Project Summary:

The Minnesota Poultry Testing Laboratory is located in Willmar, Minnesota. This project totals 11,900 gross square feet, which includes the renovation of the existing facility and a new 8,235 square foot laboratory and office space addition. The construction of the new addition consists of laboratory and support space. The renovation of the existing building space will be repurposed for offices, conference rooms, shipping and receiving and support space. Site improvements include a new loading dock area and parking.

Board of Regents Approval Summary:

Capital Budget: June 2015
Schematic Plans: November 2015

Project Team:

Architect: Alliiance
Construction Manager: McGough

Project Budget:

2015 State Appropriation $8,529,000
Total Capital Funding $8,529,000

Project Schedule:

Begin Construction: February 2016
Substantial Completion: August 2016

Consistency of project with approved scope, schedule and budget:

___ Yes ___ No
Policy Summary:

According to Board of Regents Policy *Reservation and Delegation of Authority*, Article I, Section VIII, Subdivision 9, “The Board reserves to itself the authority for a subsequent review of approved capital budget projects with a value greater than $5,000,000 prior to the award of construction contracts.”

Project Summary:

The new Bell Museum project is located on a five acre site on the southwest corner of Larpenteur and Cleveland Avenues on the St. Paul Campus. The new 92,000 gross square foot facility will house a permanent exhibit gallery, traveling exhibit gallery, planetarium (digital domed theater), touch and see room, classrooms, retail/food service, flexible shell space, administrative and museum support spaces, and site improvements.

Board of Regents Approval Summary:

- Capital Budget: June 2014
- Capital Budget Amendment: September 2015
- Schematic Plans: September 2015

Project Team:

- Architect: Perkins+Will
- Construction Manager: McGough

Project Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Debt</td>
<td>$56,915,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Foundation</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Resources</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Funding</td>
<td>$64,225,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Schedule:

- Begin Construction: May 2016
- Substantial Completion: September 2017

Consistency of project with approved scope, schedule and budget:

- X Yes
- No
# Appropriation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Allocation</th>
<th>% Spent or Encumbered Under Contract</th>
<th>% Spent, Encumbered or Otherwise Obligated to Complete a Project</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$ 88,833,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ 64,060,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 119,367,000</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 26,529,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions**

**Allocation:** The State appropriation for each project.

**Spent:** The amount the University has paid to contractors from signed contracts.

**Encumbered:** This includes:
- Project amount specifically under contract with a general contractor, architect, engineer, or other vendor.
- Internal project where work has begun and/or internal purchase order/work has been completed.

**Obligated:** Funds required to complete the project that are not yet under contract.

Note: percentages are rounded.
HEAPR Spending Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HEAPR Allocation</th>
<th>% Spent or Encumbered Under Contract</th>
<th>% Spent, Encumbered or Otherwise Obligated to Complete a Project</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$ 25,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ 50,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 42,500,000</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions

**Allocation**: The State appropriation for each project.

**Spent**: The amount the University has paid to contractors from signed contracts.

**Encumbered**: This includes:
- Project amount specifically under contract with a general contractor, architect, engineer, or other vendor.
- Internal project where work has begun and/or internal purchase order/work has been completed.

**Obligated**: Funds required to complete the project that are not yet under contract.

Note: percentages are rounded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>Life-to-Date Amount Expenses</th>
<th>Cash Balance Amount as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>(C) Spent or Encumbered</th>
<th>(D) Obligated</th>
<th>(E) Unencumbered</th>
<th>(F) Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN Poultry Testing Lab-Willmar</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>8,529,000.00</td>
<td>72,872.77</td>
<td>8,456,127.23</td>
<td>7,246,354.13</td>
<td>1,282,645.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Design Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Isolation Facility</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>18,000,000.00</td>
<td>315,646.14</td>
<td>17,684,353.86</td>
<td>1,791,871.33</td>
<td>16,208,128.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - '15 Appropriations: Major Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,529,000.00</td>
<td>388,518.91</td>
<td>26,140,481.09</td>
<td>9,038,225.46</td>
<td>17,490,774.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - 2015 State Capital Appropriations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,529,000.00</td>
<td>388,518.91</td>
<td>26,140,481.09</td>
<td>9,038,225.46</td>
<td>17,490,774.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 State Capital Appropriations: Major Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>76,867,000.00</td>
<td>15,638,131.25</td>
<td>61,228,868.75</td>
<td>70,753,063.93</td>
<td>6,113,936.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>962,487.93</td>
<td>962,487.93</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>962,487.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>29,113.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,113.77</td>
<td>29,113.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,113.77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Hall Exterior Building Environmental Replacement</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>2,358,977.73</td>
<td>390,995.92</td>
<td>1,967,981.81</td>
<td>2,228,689.99</td>
<td>130,287.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech Eng Phase II Renewal-Mech/Elec/Plumbing</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>24,800,000.00</td>
<td>21,371,718.75</td>
<td>3,428,281.25</td>
<td>24,154,640.25</td>
<td>645,359.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN Bldg Infrastructure Improvements Study</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
<td>84,344.58</td>
<td>55,655.42</td>
<td>97,070.00</td>
<td>42,930.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Hall Fire Safety &amp; Ventilation Improvements</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>152,000.00</td>
<td>50,272.68</td>
<td>101,727.32</td>
<td>108,070.00</td>
<td>43,930.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boss Lab Fire Sprinklers, Lab Compliance</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>5,200,457.75</td>
<td>231,339.99</td>
<td>4,969,117.76</td>
<td>1,036,856.00</td>
<td>4,163,601.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Design Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMD Tweed Museum of Art Mech System Upgrade</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>800,000.00</td>
<td>25,751.20</td>
<td>774,248.80</td>
<td>800,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMD Cina Hall HVAC Systems Upgrade</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>2,920,000.00</td>
<td>532,537.69</td>
<td>2,387,462.31</td>
<td>2,920,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Fiscyr</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>Life-to-Date Expenses</th>
<th>Cash Balance Amount as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>Spent or Encumbered</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
<th>Unencumbered</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMD Coleraine Minerals Lab Water Utility Replacement</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34,175.08</td>
<td>10,714.21</td>
<td>23,460.87</td>
<td>17,288.08</td>
<td>16,887.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Design Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMM Blakely Hall Elevator Installation</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>499,679.88</td>
<td>738.01</td>
<td>498,941.87</td>
<td>738.01</td>
<td>498,941.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMM Humanities HVAC Improvements</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>32,553.65</td>
<td>137,446.35</td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
<td>132,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Design Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMM Heating Plant Flue Gas Scrubber Replcmnt</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>650,000.00</td>
<td>561,055.40</td>
<td>88,944.60</td>
<td>650,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC Electrical Infrastructure Stabilization</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,180,000.00</td>
<td>2,764,383.09</td>
<td>415,616.91</td>
<td>3,030,566.39</td>
<td>149,433.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWROC Admin Bldg Abatement &amp; Structural Impr</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>119,825.69</td>
<td>30,174.31</td>
<td>129,491.16</td>
<td>20,508.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROC Agronomy &amp; Soils HVAC Improvements</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>95,000.00</td>
<td>63,907.68</td>
<td>31,092.32</td>
<td>63,907.68</td>
<td>31,092.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasca Facility Improvements (Roofs,Pumps,Windows,Floors)</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>137,000.00</td>
<td>114,372.32</td>
<td>22,627.68</td>
<td>114,372.32</td>
<td>22,627.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasca Water System Upgrades</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
<td>15,188.19</td>
<td>11,811.81</td>
<td>15,188.19</td>
<td>11,811.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloquet Forestry Ctr Elec Infrastructure</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>119,231.73</td>
<td>30,768.27</td>
<td>119,231.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,768.27</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek Whip-Poor-Will House Roof, Windows</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>44,107.86</td>
<td>472.77</td>
<td>43,635.09</td>
<td>38,914.83</td>
<td>5,193.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - '14 Appropriations: HEAPR Projects

| Subtotal - '14 Appropriations: HEAPR Projects | 42,500,000.00 | 27,397,891.48 | 15,102,108.52 | 36,525,512.56 | 5,914,605.40 | 59,882.04 |

Total - 2014 State Capital Appropriations

| Total - 2014 State Capital Appropriations | 119,367,000.00 | 43,036,022.73 | 76,330,977.27 | 107,278,576.49 | 12,028,541.47 | 59,882.04 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B) Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>(C) Life-to-Date Amount Spent or Encumbered as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>(D) Encumbered Obligated</th>
<th>(E) Unencumbered Status</th>
<th>(F) Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 State Capital Appropriations: Major Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Heat and Power Plant</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasca New Multi-Purpose Building</td>
<td>06 2016</td>
<td>4,060,000.00</td>
<td>4,044,953.82</td>
<td>15,046.18</td>
<td>4,045,792.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - '12 Appropriations: Major Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,060,000.00</td>
<td>14,044,953.82</td>
<td>15,046.18</td>
<td>14,045,792.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2012 State Capital Appropriations: HEAPR Projects** | | | | | |
| Completed Projects | | | | | |
| TC HEAPR Projects | 06 2016 | 5,462.67 | 0.00 | 5,462.67 | (0.00) | 0.00 | 5,462.67 N/A |
| Shevlin Hall Window Replacement | 06 2016 | 44,000.00 | 30,922.52 | 13,077.48 | 44,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 Design Development |
| VCRC Structural & Water Infiltration Assessment | 06 2016 | 65,500.00 | 2,573.42 | 62,926.58 | 45,550.00 | 19,950.00 | 0.00 Design Development |
| Civil Engineering Remediation | 06 2016 | 8,023,952.00 | 8,012,633.84 | 11,318.16 | 8,019,517.24 | 0.00 | 4,434.76 Pacompletion |
| Faye Thompson Center Roof Replacement | 06 2016 | 798,591.00 | 608,035.21 | 190,555.79 | 753,575.58 | (0.00) | 45,015.42 Pacompletion |
| UMM Blakely Hall Elevator Installation | 06 2016 | 187,402.77 | 17,387.34 | 170,015.43 | 25,261.99 | 162,140.78 | 0.00 Schematic Design |
| UMC HEAPR Projects | 06 2016 | 10,569.02 | 0.00 | 10,569.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10,569.02 N/A |
| **Subtotal - '12 Appropriations: HEAPR Projects** | | | | | | | |
| | 50,000,000.00 | 49,536,074.87 | 463,925.13 | 49,752,427.35 | 182,090.78 | 65,481.87 |

| Total - 2012 State Capital Appropriations | 64,060,000.00 | 63,581,028.69 | 478,971.31 | 63,798,220.24 | 182,090.79 | 79,688.98 |

| **2011 State Capital Appropriations: Major Projects** | | | | | |
| Completed Projects | | | | | |
| | 63,833,000.00 | 63,833,000.00 | 0.00 | 63,833,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| **Subtotal - '11 Appropriations: Major Projects** | | | | | | |
| | 63,833,000.00 | 63,833,000.00 | 0.00 | 63,833,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| **2011 State Capital Appropriations: HEAPR Projects** | | | | | |
| Completed Projects | | | | | |
| TC HEAPR Projects | 06 2016 | 24,896,263.65 | 24,896,263.65 | 0.00 | 24,896,263.65 | 0.00 | (0.00) |
| KE Dwan Emergency Power/Generator System Upgrade | 06 2016 | 75,000.00 | 20,004.18 | 54,995.82 | 20,004.18 | 54,995.82 | 0.00 Construction |
| **Subtotal - '11 Appropriations: HEAPR Projects** | | | | | | |
| | 25,000,000.00 | 24,916,267.83 | 83,732.17 | 24,916,267.83 | 54,995.82 | 28,736.35 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>(A) Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>(B) Life-to-Date Expenses as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>(C) Cash Balance Amount</th>
<th>(D) Encumbered Obligated</th>
<th>(E) Unencumbered Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - 2011 State Capital Appropriations</td>
<td>88,833,000.00</td>
<td>88,749,267.83</td>
<td>83,732.17</td>
<td>88,749,267.83</td>
<td>54,995.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals 2011 to 2015</td>
<td>298,789,000.00</td>
<td>195,754,838.16</td>
<td>103,034,161.84</td>
<td>268,864,290.01</td>
<td>29,756,402.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status Report: Total Capital Appropriations 2011 to 2015
As of 12/31/16 - Definitions on last page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Per Fiscyr Amount</th>
<th>Life-to-Date Amount Spent or Encumbered</th>
<th>Cash Balance Encumbered</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
<th>Unencumbered</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**

1) Definitions of columns:

   B. Appropriation Amount: The State appropriation for each project. Although HEAPR funds are appropriated in a block of funds, they are detailed in this report by the University's allocation.

   C. Spent or Encumbered: This includes three categories.
      a. Amount the University has paid to contractors from signed contracts.
      b. Project amount specifically under contract with a general contractor, architect, engineer, or other vendor.
      c. Internal project where work has begun and/or internal purchase order/work has been completed.

   D. Obligated: Funds required to complete the project that are not yet under contract.

   E. Unencumbered: Contingency funds remaining in the project after the construction phase.

2) Definitions of project phases:

   a. Programming: Defining in detail the scope of the project, describing the facility components required to accommodate the academic/operational program, and establishing the functional and physical relationships of those components.

   b. Schematic Design Development: Evaluating alternatives for meeting the project program and establishing the general size, shape, and massing of building elements; exterior finishes; and Design Development criteria for structural, mechanical, and electrical systems.

   c. Design Development: Developing the preliminary Design Development into a detailed Design Development that establishes final floor plans, building elevations, interior and exterior materials, room finishes, building systems, furnishings, and equipment.

   d. Construction Documents: Preparing detailed drawings and specifications required to obtain bids and to describe and direct the construction work.

   e. Procurement: Soliciting bids from contractors for completing the work described in the construction documents.

   f. Construction: Mobilizing of the contractor's equipment, purchasing of building materials, and implementing the work described in the construction documents.

   g. Substantial Completion: Completing work on the project to a point that the Owner can occupy and use the facility for its intended use.

   h. Closeout: Making final payments to contractors and vendors, closing all contracts, and preparing the final project accounting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Per Fiscyr</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>Life-to-Date Amount as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>Cash Balance Expenses</th>
<th>(B-C)</th>
<th>(B-C-D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>26,529,000.00</td>
<td>388,518.91</td>
<td>26,140,481.09</td>
<td>9,038,225.46</td>
<td>17,490,774.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>26,529,000.00</td>
<td>388,518.91</td>
<td>26,140,481.09</td>
<td>9,038,225.46</td>
<td>17,490,774.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>76,867,000.00</td>
<td>15,636,131.25</td>
<td>61,228,868.75</td>
<td>70,753,063.93</td>
<td>6,113,936.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>42,500,000.00</td>
<td>27,397,891.48</td>
<td>15,102,108.52</td>
<td>36,525,512.56</td>
<td>5,914,605.40</td>
<td>59,882.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>119,367,000.00</td>
<td>43,036,022.73</td>
<td>76,330,977.27</td>
<td>107,278,576.49</td>
<td>12,028,541.47</td>
<td>59,882.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14,060,000.00</td>
<td>14,044,953.82</td>
<td>15,046.18</td>
<td>14,045,792.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,536,074.87</td>
<td>463,925.13</td>
<td>49,752,427.35</td>
<td>182,090.78</td>
<td>65,481.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>64,060,000.00</td>
<td>63,581,028.69</td>
<td>478,971.31</td>
<td>63,798,220.24</td>
<td>182,090.79</td>
<td>79,688.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63,833,000.00</td>
<td>63,833,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>63,833,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>25,000,000.00</td>
<td>24,916,267.83</td>
<td>83,732.17</td>
<td>24,916,267.35</td>
<td>54,995.82</td>
<td>28,736.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>88,833,000.00</td>
<td>88,749,267.83</td>
<td>83,732.17</td>
<td>88,749,267.83</td>
<td>54,995.82</td>
<td>28,736.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>181,289,000.00</td>
<td>93,904,603.98</td>
<td>87,384,396.02</td>
<td>157,670,082.27</td>
<td>23,604,710.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR and Converted HEAPR Projects Only</td>
<td></td>
<td>117,500,000.00</td>
<td>101,850,234.18</td>
<td>15,649,765.82</td>
<td>111,194,207.74</td>
<td>6,151,692.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Percent by Status | 2015 Appropriations | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Major Projects | 26,529,000.00 | 34% | 66% | 0% |
| HEAPR Projects | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Subtotal | 26,529,000.00 | 34% | 66% | 0% |
| Major Projects | 76,867,000.00 | 92% | 8% | 0% |
| HEAPR Projects | 42,500,000.00 | 88% | 14% | 0% |
| Subtotal | 119,367,000.00 | 90% | 10% | 0% |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>2011 Appropriations</th>
<th>Grand Total: 2011-2015 Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Fiscyr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriation Amount</td>
<td>Life-to-Date Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Cash Balance Amount as of 12/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Spent or Encumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Obligated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Unencumbered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F) Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>63,833,000.00</td>
<td>298,789,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>25,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>88,833,000.00</td>
<td>90% 10% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
<th>Life-to-Date Expenses</th>
<th>Cash Balance Amount as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>(C) Spent or Encumbered</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
<th>Unencumbered</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>14,060,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>64,060,000.00</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>63,833,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR Projects</td>
<td>25,000,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>88,833,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total: 2011-2015 Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>181,288,000.00</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPR and Converted HEAPR Projects Only</td>
<td>117,500,000.00</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>