

THE COLORADO COLLEGE

Campus Master Planning

Issues: Project Scope and Costs
 Selection of a Campus Master Planner

The original budget for Campus Master Planning was \$150,000. President Mohrman indicates that she is willing to increase it to \$250,000 including \$25,000 for contingency. The fee proposals submitted by Sasaki and Thompson Rose are in excess of \$300,000. The selection subcommittee is requested to review the proposed scope of work to identify elements of the project to be reduced or eliminated. To facilitate this process, you may wish to refer to the College's original RFP outlining our goals and objectives and specific outcomes; selected sections are summarized below.

After narrowing the scope of work, a campus master planner needs to be selected. As the committee favors Thompson Rose, we need to ensure that it can meet our needs and expectations; we should identify questions/issues that should be addressed by Charles Rose during his visit here on June 13-14th.

Background

The reasons for preparing a campus master plan as articulated in Richard Dober's treatise "Campus Design" (1992) can be summarized as:

- To provide the institution with a sense of place that proclaims the college's purposes, distinction, and domain.
- To determine and coordinate the location of existing and future campus improvements so as to achieve a functional, attractive, and comprehensive campus design.
- To understand opportunities and initiatives that transcend immediate problems and solutions; so the institution can act decisively when it is timely and prudent to do so.
- To have a well conceived physical framework for making day-to-day physical development decisions -- a framework flexible enough to accommodate changing circumstances and conditions not foreseeable at the time the plan was formulated.
- To document, for those outside the institution (donors, foundations, government, friends, accreditation agencies, and others), that the institution's physical resources in hand, and those to be acquired, are well managed.

Dober identifies the following elements for inclusion in a campus master plan; these criteria were included in our RFP as requirements of our master plan report:

- Academic/Student Life and Residence Halls/Support BUILDING AREA requirements over the next 20 years (new, reconstructed, continued, reassigned, demolished)

- Academic/Residential Life/Athletic LAND AREA requirements over the next 20 years
- Building location plan
- Open space/athletic-recreational fields location plan
- Development plan for the east campus
- Urban traffic interface plan
- Pedestrian way plan
- Vehicle circulation plan
- Parking plan
- Land acquisition and development plan
- Landscape standards
- Building design standards
- Lighting/streetscape standards

Colorado College's specifications for its Master Plan describe the purpose, aesthetic goals, and objectives for the project. To summarize, the plan process must identify, clarify, and shape a long-term vision for the CC campus. A major goal of the plan is to establish a design framework ensuring that proportions, scale, placement of structures, features, and landscaping work aesthetically and functionally with other projects--even those developed at a later date. We value new insights gained from experiences at other institutions, but recognize that such contributions are likely to be welcomed here only when we see that they answer questions that we have posed or solve local problems.

The six objectives of CC's Campus Master Plan are:

- To survey and analyze existing instructional space to adapt it more closely to the College's special academic program needs associated with the Block Plan.
- To survey and analyze residential life facilities and needs with an emphasis on greater integration of the academic program with residential life.
- To determine a creative solution to our need for more athletic/recreation facilities and fields.
- To assess the environmental impacts on the campus and of the campus including landscaping, energy use, traffic control, parking, and integration of the CC's Campus with the surrounding park lands, residential areas, and cultural institutions.
- To find the best and highest use for the newly acquired property, protecting neighborhood interests and taking prudent care of historic resources.
- To develop a plan for improved infrastructure including a greater capacity for technology functions.

It is anticipated that the final product will be a written report that addresses the six objectives outlined above with appropriate plans and graphics. The report is to include:

- Campus space use: inventory of existing space use and needs: academic, residential, athletic/recreational, administrative, student services, and parking.
- Analysis of space use: resolution of needs including costs for renovations and new facilities.
- Priority list of projects.
- Recommendations on locations for future buildings.
- Strategy for land utilization and acquisition decisions.
- Strategy for landscape, parking, and pedestrian/vehicular circulation decisions.
- Strategy for neighborhood and community interface.
- Design criteria for new buildings, renovations, and landscaping.
- Implementation plan.
- Model to illustrate campus master plan.
- A computer inventory of facilities with room information and usage by square footage.
- Materials to use in the capital campaign case statement.

Essential information needed for the plan includes an inventory of existing buildings, including types, size, age, utilization, condition, tenancy, location and historic features. With the exception of the inventory of interior spaces, much of this information is already available in the Facilities Condition Report and the Historic Assessment, both completed within the past two years. The inventory of interior spaces can be accomplished efficiently through a combination of local professional services (eg, CSNA architects) and campus staff/students.

A key factor in the master plan for an urban campus like Colorado College is the ability of the proposed plan to integrate into the long range development of the City of Colorado Springs (both land use and traffic), the State Highway Department, and surrounding areas such as the Downtown District, North End and Weber-Wahsatch Historic Districts, Monument Valley Park, etc. We are considering using a local planning firm, NES, to facilitate this community liaison.

Analysis of Firms

After competitive bids from five firms and interviews with three firms, the field has been narrowed to Thompson and Rose/Child Associates and Sasaki Associates. The firms proposed a similar scope of work, but have very different strengths and weaknesses. The Campus Master Planning Committee favored Thompson and Rose, but felt an additional campus interview was needed to clarify its campus planning experience and project methodology.

In reviewing the fee proposals submitted by Sasaki and Thompson and Rose, it was difficult to compare the scope of work and related fees. An addendum to the specifications was sent to both firms asking them for clarification. In addition, each firm was requested to indicate how they would reduce costs to \$225,000. Because we have not yet received the revised financial estimates, the financial summary will be available on June 8th.

Thompson and Rose Architects is a small architectural firm located in Cambridge, Massachusetts which is teaming with Susan Child, an experienced landscape architect. Charles Rose received his BA in Architecture from Princeton in 1983 and his Masters of Architecture from Harvard in 1987. He worked with Kenyon College on planning and designing residence

hall facilities. Child Associates has campus planning background at Skidmore College, Phillips Exeter Academy, and Middlesex School. Both principals have taught architecture, planning, and landscape design theory at Rice, Harvard, and Northeastern Universities.

Strengths

- Background in campus design work and understanding the culture of academic institutions.
- Commitment to make Colorado College's Master Plan a unique award-winning plan.
- Ability to present creative solutions. Their presentation showed a creative critique of the CC campus and issues.
- Views the CC Project as an opportunity to build a reputation as campus planners.
- Appears to relate well to the college community.

Weaknesses

- Lack of experience in campus master planning. The firm has a learning curve that will involve a longer and more extensive time commitment by college staff.
- With only three people in the firm, there is a lack of organizational depth.

References

Comments from a telephone check of references: "Described several times as "brilliant." They are extraordinarily thorough about their work. Not much of a track record, but their top-flight credentials and ambition compensate. Clients remarked that T&R clearly are rising stars and are likely to be a ranking American architectural firm. They put everything in context (historical, environmental, educational) and do a superb job of first learning about an institution and then educating others about the possibilities. Fun to work with. Susan Child, on her consulting work at Phillips Exeter...very strong, accomplished."

Sasaki is a large 40-year-old firm (182 professionals) located in Watertown, Massachusetts, which has done campus planning for more than 150 colleges. John Jensen, the principal, received his Bachelor of Landscape Architecture from the University of Oregon in 1971. The firm is able to draw from a multi-disciplinary staff of planners, architects, landscape architects, civil engineers, traffic planners, and interior designers. They have completed plans recently for other colleges similar to Colorado College: Lewis and Clark College, Wheaton College (Mass.), Vassar, Harvey Mudd, Southwestern College (Texas), and Keene State College (N.H.).

Strengths

- Strong and extensive background in campus master planning.
- Experience at other similar small liberal arts colleges.
- Large firm with multi-disciplinary staff.
- Understands methodology.
- Well established firm with an excellent national reputation.

Weaknesses

- Presentation was very general.
- May use generic formula to campus planning; commitment to provide a creative or visionary plan for Colorado College is uncertain.

References

Comments from a telephone check of references for Sasaki Associates, Inc: "A very experienced firm. May be inclined to trot out their formulae and not pay enough attention to the client's needs. Very good with Vassar about paying attention to their huge and historic landscape; helped shape fundraising for a 'heritage fund' to improve it. Terrific at Lewis and Clark about dealing with a difficult campus topography and worked well with faculty."