**Campus Planning Committee Meeting**

**Tuesday, August 20, 2013**

**1:00 pm -2:30pm**

**221 Weill Hall**

**Meeting Minutes**

*Attending: Steven Wolf (chair), Susan Riley, Tanya Husick, Kent Hubbell, Todd Bittner, Don Rakow, Gilbert Delgado, Bill Bader (guest), Robert Griffin, Michael Manville, Kristin Gutenberger, Pete Salino, Dave Cutter, John Gutenberger, Abraham Stroock, Tom Cole and Mina Amundsen*

Steve welcomed attendees and went over the agenda items – the discussion of the BME siting options, a need for funding strategy for University/enabling projects and a process for the Campus Master Plan variance. The meeting focused on the BME options and introduced the discussion on the other two, which will be continued in subsequent CPC meetings.

BME Siting Options Discussion – Bill Bader, Director of Facilities with the College of Engineering, presented the BME project purpose and need as well as important considerations for the college, including vivarium access.  Mina walked the group through the different site options as well as the issues that went with each of them.  The highlights of the discussion were a general acceptance of the Grumman/Hoy site and a few members expressed a preference for the Alumni/Weill site and/or the Upson site.  Mark Cruvellier encouraged reconsideration of the Upson site if Alumni/Weill was not possible.  There were questions about the very large footprint shown on the Hoy site. Mina explained that the images showed the full site capacity and not the BME footprint alone. There was a question about open space – and how taking an athletic field created open space. Mina explained that while the field was relocated for another use, a new open space was created with far greater access to the campus community.

With the Alumni/Weill site also there was a concern raised related to the loss of open space and how that would relate to the PSCC and the campus sustainability goal of no net loss of open space.  Was there a possibility that the open space lost on Alumni Fields could be replaced or the new quad be realigned to have the same amount of open space?  The master plan is highly integrated and changes to one area or part have implications for other issues and systems.  There was a question from a new member about adherence to a map that seems arbitrary versus the principles of the plan.  Mina explained that the vision plan was an expression of the principles, based in the physical and community context, and created with the input of hundreds of community members (Cornell and Ithaca) over two years, and is not an arbitrary arrangement.  We will need to explain the plan to new members so that the discussion on variances is better informed.

The Alumni/Weill site raises the issue of completing a part of Alumni Quad and the loss of parking and its eventual replacement on the central campus.  Both are partially University projects and partly benefit the project.  There are infrastructural and environmental issues that go with each site and that need to be considered.  However, there is no process currently to make the determination of what portion the project should pay.  Non-compliance with the plan should have a higher cost, to be a deterrent and to also reflect the true cost of making the change.  Gutie advised that relocating the fields would raise community concerns but that Hoy Field was consistent with the master plan and the consistency with the master plan would help us with approvals, whereas Alumni Fields would be a harder battle.

In concluding, the CPC unanimously agreed that both issues needed to be taken up in the immediate term – the master plan variance and university enabling projects. The next meeting on September 18 will take up the issues of the Campus Master Plan variance process and university/enabling projects.