



**Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting**  
**Thursday, March 7, 2024**  
**Zoom**

**MINUTES**

---

**1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks**

The Florida International University Board of Trustees' Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Natasha Lowell on Thursday, March 7, 2024, at 9:28 AM.

General Counsel Carlos B. Castillo conducted roll call of the Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee members and verified a quorum. Present were Trustees Natasha Lowell, *Committee Chair*; and Alan Gonzalez, *Committee Vice Chair*; Provost and Executive Vice President Elizabeth M. Bejar; and Vice President for Operations and Safety and Chief of Staff Javier I. Marques; and Trustees Marc D. Sarnoff; Alexander P. Sutton; and Roger Tovar, *Board Chair*.

The following Board members were also in attendance: Board Vice Chair Carlos A. Duarte, and Trustees Noël C. Barengo, Dean C. Colson, and Francis A. Hondal.

Committee Chair Lowell welcomed Trustees and members of the administration, and thanked Trustees, not serving on this Committee, for participating. She also welcomed faculty, staff, members of the University community, and the general public.

Committee Chair Lowell explained that the Committee will be reviewing the most recent updates that have been incorporated into the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan based on recommendations received thus far. She added that the Committee should reach consensus prior to releasing the draft of the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan for the public hearing phase. She noted that a pending item relates to the proposed location of the future aquatic center to be included in the Plan. She commented that, upon the conclusion of the public hearings, the Campus Master Plan will be presented for Board of Trustees approval.

**2. Discussion Item** (*No Action Required*)

**2.1 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan (CMP) Update**

Associate Vice President for Facilities Management John Cal indicated that the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan will be presented for Board of Trustees approval in September or November 2024. He thanked the campus planning team of the DLR Group, Krisan Osterby, Priyanka Saglani, and Eddie Kim. AVP Cal introduced Principal and Higher Education Leader at the DLR Group, Dan Sullivan and Stuart Isaac from the Isaac Sports Group. AVP Cal also recognized Director for Facilities Planning Robert (Bob) Griffith. AVP Cal commented on the remaining key issue pertaining to the location of the aquatics center. He indicated that while a final decision is not required, a site must be

identified on the Campus Master Plan. He added that the selected site may require the relocation of impacted facilities. AVP Cal remarked on the March 7, 2024 deadline for the March 10, 2024 Miami Herald ad for the March 21-22, 2024 public hearing dates.

AVP Cal explained that the campus master planning process began with an update at the June 2023 Board of Trustees Full Board Meeting. He explained that the Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee was subsequently formed by Board Chair Roger Tovar. AVP Cal indicated that the Committee held its first meeting in October 2023. He added that in response to the Committee's request at said meeting, 29 potential development options were identified at the Modesto A. Maidique Campus (MMC), and test fits were prepared for student housing, medical partnerships, and athletic/recreation facilities. AVP Cal pointed out that the Committee met again in December and engaged in a thorough review of said development sites and test fits. He stated that the Committee reviewed 12 potential sites for the aquatic center. He mentioned that the Committee requested further analysis on potential sites for the aquatics center. AVP Cal provided a target timeline pertaining to the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan. He presented graphics of land use plans for MMC, which also highlighted the test fit locations.

In response to Committee Chair Lowell, AVP Cal commented on the potential site for the clinical partnership, which is currently the site of the University apartments. Further responding to Committee Chair Lowell, AVP Cal stated that while this represented a loss of just under 200 beds, the Board of Trustees approved a new 800-bed student residence facility. In response to Committee Chair Lowell, Trustee Alexander P. Sutton stated that he was in support so long as there was a net positive result in the number of beds available for student housing. In response to Trustee Sutton, Board Chair Tovar commented that it was expected that the timing of the demolition of the University apartments would not take place prior to breaking ground on the new student residence facility, and that if there were to be a gap in timing, it would not be significant.

AVP Cal presented graphics of the land use plans and potential development sites for the Engineering Center and the Biscayne Bay Campus. AVP Cal remarked that the Committee will review three potential sites for the aquatic center, which included the following areas: in or near to University Graham Center (GC)/Academic Health Center (AHC) 1, site 11; Blue parking garage, site 7; and athletics/recreation corridor, site 24. In response to Committee Chair Lowell, AVP Cal indicated that, while the look will vary, all three proposed sites fit the required program. He commented that at a minimum, the FIU aquatics program needs call for a main pool and deck space that can also accommodate diving. In response to feedback from the Committee, AVP Cal remarked that program needs were expanded to include a recreation pool, jacuzzi, and deck space to enhance the appeal of the pool facility for use by the wider University community. He added that the aquatics program now also included a training pavilion which would also be available for use by the wider University community in addition to a support building with community spaces. He pointed out that the area footprint totaled approximately 62,374 gross square feet.

Mr. Sullivan shared his background as a student athlete and his professional work on sports and recreation projects. He commented on each of the proposed sites. He stated that while site 11 is centrally located, there are challenges with the location of the AHC1 building to the north and the GC expansion to the south. He added that said location challenges have led to an L-shaped

configuration, with the competition pool in an east-west configuration, which is not ideal. He pointed out that north-south is the ideal orientation for a pool, which allows athletes and spectators to comfortably avoid sun glare issues and allows placement of the dive tower, ideally, or springboard, on the south end of the pool. Mr. Sullivan stated that the deck space in site 11 is tighter than that of sites 7 and 24. He remarked on issues related to noise levels potentially impacting nearby facilities. He commented that the east side of the competition pool would include the dry land pavilion, athletic locker and team rooms, and the athletic offices. He mentioned that the recreational pool was shifted to the north to keep the allée of trees north of GC and includes a community-oriented structure with locker rooms.

In response to Committee Chair Lowell, Mr. Sullivan stated that students would be able to use the facility whenever varsity is not practicing and that the proposed placement would be unique given that the pool would not be near to the recreation center. Mr. Isaac remarked that a schedule matrix was developed in order to determine how students, faculty, staff, and athletes would use the pool. He noted that the competition pool will provide athletes with priority access for the hours they require while the recreation pool provides priority use for students, faculty, and staff throughout the day.

Trustee Dean C. Colson inquired as to the possibility of joining the athletic and community support buildings. Mr. Sullivan stated that the site posed constraints in terms of the trees to the north of GC and parking lot to the north of the competition pool, which could not be relocated. In response to University President Kenneth A. Jessell, AVP Cal indicated that the primary driver in said L-shaped configuration was an effort to maintain the trees currently in that location. AVP Cal added that while said trees can be moved, they will likely not be used as often as they are used in their current location. Board Chair Tovar stated that said trees can be relocated to the adjacent green spaces and this should not be a factor that is driving design. Ms. Osterby indicated that the current L-shaped configuration was also driven by the intent of having an aquatics facility with a strong presence, with a lobby and drop-off area as important considerations. She added that moving the pool, would result in significantly less visibility from the road.

Mr. Sullivan presented aerial views of site 11. He noted that 15 to 20 feet of deck space are needed around the competition pool and that under the current configuration, site 11 is at the minimum amount of space needed. Mr. Isaac added that the limited deck space constricts the ability for flexible programming and particularly event capacity. He stated that while dual meets and invitationals could be accommodated under the proposed configuration, the number of competitors and spectators would be limited for larger competitions. He commented that diving could only be incorporated into the side of the competition pool under said configuration, as opposed to at the end of the pool. Mr. Isaac indicated that said configuration requires two different seating areas and limits the amount of available lap lanes. He further stated that said configuration could also limit the exposure of the varsity swimming and diving team and decreases revenue potential. In response to Athletic Director Scott Carr, Mr. Isaac pointed out that while diving wells should face north, there was insufficient space lengthwise to locate the diving well at the end of the pool. Mr. Sullivan indicated that said configuration allows for approximately 300 spectators.

In response to Trustee Marc D. Sarnoff, Mr. Isaac stated that while not mandated by USA Swimming Standards or the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), pools are oriented north-south as a best practice. Further responding to Trustee Sarnoff, Mr. Isaac indicated that the ability to have diving and swimming concurrently is a best practice for collegiate competition. Further responding to Trustee Sarnoff, Mr. Isaac added that the proposed configurations for all sites provide the flexibility to meet the collegiate sports needs now and in the foreseeable future. Further responding to Trustee Sarnoff, Mr. Isaac commented that FIU Panthers Swimming and Diving head coach Randy Horner confirmed that a separate diving well was not needed.

Mr. Sullivan commented that site 7 is situated in a public entry location, over an existing parking area, and near student housing. He added that said location allows for a northeast-southwest configuration of the competition pool, a one-story support building, diving well located to the south of the pool that faces northeast, additional surface parking, green spaces, 20 to 25 feet of deck space, and opportunities for a potential future building site. Mr. Isaac stated that site 7 meets projected event needs comfortably. In response to Trustee Colson, Mr. Sullivan indicated that there are possibilities to add additional floors to the support building. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the wider deck space also allows for approximately 800 spectator seats.

Mr. Sullivan remarked that while site 24 is situated near to the other athletic venues, the Panther parking garage, and the Ocean Bank Convocation Center, it is further away from student housing. He noted that competition pools are commonly located within a campus' athletics district. He stated that this site, like site 7, is situated over an existing surface parking area. He added that said location allows for an ideal north-south orientation for the competition pool, diving well located to the south of the pool that faces north, generous amount of deck space with seating to the west and additional surface parking. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the planned future road realignment would not impact said configuration.

Mr. Sullivan presented an overview comparing sites 11, 7, and 24. He noted that site 11 has the smallest footprint and highest cost estimate and operating subsidy. Mr. Isaac indicated that separating the support buildings in site 11 added to the cost estimate and operating subsidy. Mr. Isaac pointed out that 2% of construction costs are set aside for operating subsidies as mandated by the state. He remarked that the operating subsidies do not account for potential revenue streams. He mentioned that sites 7 and 24 allow for greater programming flexibility and event capacity. He explained that Coach Horner prefers site 7 over 24 given the proximity to student housing, which is where the student athletes reside. He shared Coach Horner's concern that facilities located in the athletic corridor are perceived as athletics-only facilities. Mr. Sullivan stated that a facility on site 7 fosters a greater sense of community.

Board Chair Tovar commented on the importance of continuing to improve campus life. He remarked on the centrally located pool at the University of Miami. He stated that site 11 can be reconfigured to have a north-south oriented competition pool with a north facing dive well. He noted that the operating subsidy can be reduced by a reconfiguration that will not need to separate support buildings. He mentioned that the cost estimate is only slightly higher for site 11. Board Chair Tovar remarked that he would discard site 24 as an option because it could be perceived as a pool solely intended for athletics as opposed to a community pool. He indicated that while site 7

offered additional space and visibility, it is not located in pedestrian areas. He further stated that site 11 is in closer proximity to off-campus housing.

Trustee Alan Gonzalez concurred with Board Chair Tovar regarding site 11 and requested projected revenue streams of sites 11 and 7. In response to Committee Chair Lowell, Mr. Isaac stated that site 7 would have greater revenue streams as it relates to the access for outside clubs and event revenue with the ability to host larger events. He added that revenue from student-based programming, student access, and community swim lessons would be comparable for sites 11 and 7. Trustee Sarnoff commented on his view of site 7 as the preferred site but recognizes the rationale for the consideration of site 11. He added that dive wells can be located exterior of the competition lanes and that pools should be built to anticipate future needs.

Committee members concurred that site 24 should not be considered as a possible location and that a reconfiguration of site 11 should be undertaken. Trustee Colson requested that site 11's reconfiguration combine the separate support buildings. Trustee Colson added that the proposed support building in site 7 should be reconfigured, if possible, to add more floors which can be used for student housing or classrooms. Trustee Gonzalez stated that proximity to food venues is also an important factor. Trustee Sutton concurred with Trustee comments and the request to reconfigure site 11. Board Vice Chair Carlos A. Duarte concurred to abandon site 24 as a possible site. He stated that site 7 would likely be used by students residing on campus while site 11 had the potential for greater use campus- and community-wide. Provost and Executive Vice President Elizabeth M. Bejar concurred on the need to reconfigure site 11 and analyze the implications relating to site 7 pertaining to parking, food, and the possibility of adding additional floors to the support building. Vice President for Operations and Safety and Chief of Staff Javier I. Marques stated that if site 11 can offer additional spectator seating once reconfigured, possible revenue streams for sites 11 and 7 will be comparable.

Board Chair Tovar stated that once an appropriate site for the aquatics center was identified and schematics developed, a decision on moving forward can be made. AVP Cal noted that as requested, a follow-up meeting will be scheduled to continue the consideration of site 7 and review the reconfiguration of site 11. In response to Committee Chair Lowell, AVP Cal commented on the implications to the timeline. He remarked that the March 7, 2024 deadline for the March 10, 2024 Miami Herald ad would no longer be met and, therefore, the March 21-22, 2024 public hearing dates would also need to be rescheduled for a later date following the Committee's next meeting. He added that Board of Trustees approval would likely now shift to November 2024. Board Chair Tovar requested that the support building on site 7 be reconfigured with greater verticality. Board Chair Tovar stated that every option to be considered should incorporate a separate dive pit and an impactful architectural design element. In response to Board Chair Tovar, AVP Cal stated that the building currently contemplated on site 11, which is designated as the Science Laboratory Complex could be combined with the AHC Interdisciplinary 4 building. In terms of site 7, AVP Cal added that the building designated as Academic 7 could be combined with the building designated as Academic 6 in the future. AVP Cal stated that the requested follow-up should be completed in time for the Committee to plan its next meeting for April.

### **3. New Business**

Committee Chair Lowell thanked the Committee, the University leadership, AVP Cal, Mr. Bob Griffith, the DLR group, and the Isaac Sports Group.

### **4. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment**

With no other new business, Committee Chair Natasha Lowell adjourned the meeting of the Florida International University Board of Trustees Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting on Thursday, March 7, 2024, at 11:51 AM.

DRAFT