



Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
Monday, May 6, 2024
FIU, Modesto A. Maidique Campus
The Patricia and Phillip Frost Art Museum, R105

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 Monday, May 6, 2024, at 11:01 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 (Zoom)*; Provost and Executive Vice President Elizabeth M. Bejar; and Vice President for Operations and Safety and Chief of Staff Javier I. Marques; and Trustees Francesca Casanova; Marc D. Sarnoff (*Zoom*); and Roger Tovar, *Board Chair*.

The following Board members were also in attendance: Dean C. Colson, and Francis A. Hondal.

Committee Chair Lowell welcomed Trustees and members of the administration. 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 to the aquatics center program based on feedback received at the last Campus Master Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting. 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 in May. She commented that, upon the conclusion of the public hearings, the Campus Master Plan will be presented for Board of Trustees approval in November 2024.

2. Discussion Item (*No Action Required*)

2.1 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan (CMP) Update

Associate Vice President for Facilities Management John Cal acknowledged Holocaust Remembrance Day and shared a personal account. Committee Chair Natasha Lowell asked that AVP Cal point out areas of flexibility in the land-use plan. AVP Cal commented that the only pending item on the master plan is the location of the aquatic facility. He commented on the alignment of the master plan with the University strategy noting involvement from the Strategic Planning Committee in the master planning process. He shared that the objective for workshop #4 was to approve the release of the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan Update for public comment with first public hearings to take place May 29-30. He shared that the last key issue was the location of the aquatic center. He detailed the comments and guidance from workshop #3 including: re-

assessing sites 11 and 7 for north-south orientation, consideration of a "bump-out" for dive well, considering proximity to food venues, considering higher density planned and future development, and considering best practices. He remarked that the master plan is resource unconstrained, and that the execution of the master plan is resource constrained. He noted that the selection of the location will have ripple effects requiring the relocation of planned academic and parking facilities at AHC-1 (site 11) or 16th Street Gateway (site 7) but that accommodations can be made. He added that there is a May 16th deadline for the May 19th Miami Herald advertisement announcing the May 29th and May 30th Public Hearing Dates. He provided an overview of the revised timeline including the public hearing and comment phases, revision period and Board of Trustees review and approval. Committee Chair Lowell requested to be provided with any public comments that are shared during the public comment period. AVP Cal shared that site 24 was removed as an option during the workshop #3 and that during workshop #4 sites 7 and 11 would be reviewed. He highlighted planned future developments at the Modesto A. Maidique Campus (MMC) noting that it is resource unconstrained but depicts the full development of the campus. He introduced the consultants who have worked on the development of the master plan including Krisan Osterby, Stuart Isaac, Dan Sullivan, Steve Crocker, and Eddie Kim and shared their background and credentials in their respective fields.

Mr. Isaac further detailed his background in the aquatic business field. He noted the program elements that support the goals of the facility. He shared that he has met with various constituencies at FIU to fine-tune the elements presented since the prior meeting. He provided details on the locker rooms, dry-land pavilion, and community, support, and common spaces. Mr. Isaac commented on the event capabilities and opportunities associated with the aquatic center including university swimming and diving meets, high school meets, USA Swimming meets, USA Diving and AAU Diving meets. He explained the north-south orientation of the pool, noting that it is not required or significantly impactful for competitions. He mentioned that diving boards should not be facing due west. He shared examples of 50-meter pool orientations across locations that have recently hosted national swimming or diving championships. He shared the projected parking and seating requirements associated with the aquatic center noting the importance of access and convenience for users of the pool. He introduced the aquatic programming for the main pool including the training and competition requirements and the recreational program use. He shared the potential aquatic programming for the rec and leisure pool. Senior Vice President for Human Resources El pagnier K. Hudson inquired about ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliance and whether the pool would have a lift for wheelchairs. Mr. Isaac noted that the pool would contain a lift and/or primary access ADA element. He mentioned that this can be achieved with a wheelchair ramp, elevator system, or wide stairs and emphasized the importance of the pool being accessible for all individuals. Mr. Isaac presented various options for the stretch 50-meter configuration of the pool including a 50-meter course, dual 25-yard courses in two (2) directions, a single 25-yard course, or dual 25-yard courses in one (1) direction. He also presented additional configurations including dual 25-meter courses, single 25-meter courses, water polo, and a dive well 50 meter "L" shape.

Ms. Osterby presented the site 11 programmatic, pedestrian, and parking adjacencies. Committee Chair Lowell inquired as to whether sites 11 and 7 can both accommodate a 50-meter stretch pool and Ms. Osterby advised that both sites offer a variety of potential configurations that support the 50-meter stretch pool layout. Ms. Osterby pointed out the proximity of dining options to site 11 and the footpaths that students can take to the pool. Committee Chair Lowell asked the Committee if there were any comments regarding site 11. Ms. Osterby presented the site 11 development site and

pointed out that it has been expanded westward and detailed that it can now accommodate the north-south configuration and increased deck space. Ms. Osterby commented on the need for relocation of the trees. Mr. Sullivan presented the site 11 detailed test fit and existing site plan, noting the added parking as a result of the north-south configuration as opposed to the original east-west pool configuration. He detailed the dry-land pavilion, locker rooms, storage space, and deck space. He explained that both sites 11 and 7 include two (2) story support buildings and include an elevator. Committee Chair Lowell inquired about the seating capacity and Mr. Isaac clarified that the future seating capacity is set at 675 which is above the ideal minimum seating capacity of 500. He noted that the maximum capacity could be 800 seats however, it is not factored into the cost and design of site 11 and would require expanding the space of the aquatic facility further west. Ms. Osterby addressed the prior concern of having a raised pool deck. She advised that for storm water protection, the pool deck will be on grade but will be raised by three (3) feet and that the support buildings would be raised by approximately one (1) foot. Senior Vice President for University Advancement and CEO of the FIU Foundation, Inc., Kenneth C. Hall inquired about the spectator stand capacity and location of the judges for diving competitions. Mr. Isaac pointed out where judges could be seated at competitions on the slide. Mr. Sullivan advised that the design currently includes the minimum required amount of deck space and presented a campus fit model with the aquatic center in the developed Campus Master Plan. Ms. Osterby further detailed the fit of the pool on site 11 within the scope of the planned future sites of the master plan.

Ms. Osterby presented the programmatic, pedestrian, and parking adjacencies for site 7A. She detailed that the space had been expanded further west. Mr. Sullivan shared that this proposed site and layout provides more generous deck space and is closer a capacity of 800 seats for spectators. He noted the location of the dry-land pavilion, second floor of the support building and viewing deck, and a future academic building. Ms. Osterby presented the master plan context for site 7A, noting expanded parking in the Gold Parking Garage. Mr. Sullivan presented various arial views of the aquatic center on site 7A with the planned future buildings. He presented option 7B which includes a straight north-south orientation for the pool. He noted that the support building would be narrower and that a recreational pool can still be included in this configuration. He added that the future academic building would be placed south of the pool. Ms. Osterby presented the site 7B campus fit model. Mr. Sullivan presented three-dimensional renderings of the site 7B test-fit in the master plan.

Mr. Isaac noted that a key element includes the use of the recreational pool by all students even if competitions are taking place at the aquatic facility. He pointed out that with configuration 7B, students and community members would need to walk through events to reach the recreational pool from the community locker rooms. He showed how the site 7A configuration is advantageous due to closer proximity from the community locker rooms to the recreational pool. Committee Chair Lowell proposed eliminating the option of site 7B, noting that it is important for students to be able to access the recreational pool. Mr. Isaac showed that on site 11, students have direct access to the recreational pool from the community lockers but that athletes would need to cross the leisure deck to access the athletics lockers.

Mr. Isaac provided a summary of sites 11 and 7 including option 7A and 7B for the configuration of the aquatic center. He commented on the operating costs of the facility. Mr. Sullivan shared a comparison of the construction footprint, existing parking, net parking, seating capacity, total project cost projection, direct net operating revenue (in year 3), annual capital reserve allocation, and

the minimum operating subsidy for sites 11, 7A, and 7B. He noted that the yearly minimum operating subsidy is approximately \$60,000 greater in site 11 versus site 7A. Committee Chair Lowell asked about the research regarding noise and light pollution from the aquatic center area and Mr. Sullivan noted anecdotal evidence showing that there is less impact on site 7 overall.

Sr. VP Hall inquired about the practical use of the expanded deck space on site 11 and its potential uses including study and lounge areas. Mr. Sullivan shared that it is a good option to have for a best practice design of a facility. Sr. VP Hall asked if there are any deterrents to having open traffic of cars near the diving platform for divers and Mr. Isaac advised that it would not be an issue. Trustee Marc D. Sarnoff commented on the benefits of having increased deck space in the aquatic facility. He noted that in site 7A there is more deck space than in site 11 and noted that if the pool on site 11 could be shifted further west it could accommodate greater deck space. Trustee Sarnoff inquired about the use of “bulk heads” in the 50-meter stretch pool and Mr. Isaac clarified that they can be moved to provide for different configurations of the pool. Mr. Isaac provided a detailed explanation of how the “bulk heads” can be placed to create different layouts of the 50-meter stretch pool.

Trustee Francis A. Hondal inquired about the usage of the space between student athletes, students, and community members. Mr. Isaac presented a sample schedule matrix that includes programming for FIU athletics, students, and community members and outside user groups using the main competition pool, recreation and leisure pool, and dry-land training pavilion. He noted that the matrix has aided in the identification of revenue streams, and necessity for lifeguards. Trustee Hondal advised that she would like more context regarding the percentage of use by students, student athletes and community members. Mr. Isaac advised that the schedule matrix presented would likely be a representation of year three (3) of the aquatic center being open. Ms. Osterby advised that the open spaces could be used by student organizations, for classrooms, and for community members.

University President Kenneth A. Jessell inquired about the earned revenues and total operating expenses prior to the capital recovery. Mr. Isaac noted that revenue is broken down into facility revenue and program revenue. He also detailed the operational expenses and program expenses. He noted that there is a net direct revenue in year three (3) of \$78,000. President Jessell inquired about the depth of the main 50-meter stretch pool, and Mr. Isaac explained that there should be a minimum depth of seven (7) feet in a competition pool and 17-feet deep in the dive-well. He noted that both depths are a foot deeper than the minimum regulation.

Trustee Dean C. Colson suggested the idea of leaving both sites 11 and 7 open as options on the master plan and AVP Cal confirmed that the aquatic site can be left at both locations to then have it brought forward for public comment. Trustee Colson added that he believes some of the best architecture he has seen in the United States is around swimming pools and that something special should be developed for FIU. Trustee Alan Gonzalez commented that the meeting was very helpful and informative and that he concurs with Trustee Colson’s suggestion. Board Chair Roger Tovar commented that the pool can bring community members to MMC. He noted that having the pool close to the Blue Parking Garage will not bring patrons into campus. He commented that on site 11 the deck space could potentially be increased and about the loss of parking as a result of placing the pool on site 7. He remarked that the pool should be placed in a location that is close to where the students congregate and noted that site 11 would be ideal for this. President Jessell commented that it is important that the aquatic center is on the master plan and has been reviewed

and that when the funding is acquired the decision can be made accordingly. Board Chair Tovar requested a rendering of the aquatic center and inquired as to the associated cost. Trustee Sarnoff clarified that Board Chair Tovar could be requesting a “CAD” (computer-aided design) of the pool. Ms. Osterby commented that a CAD could be easily produced using a combination of the renderings and models that have already been created of the campus. Trustee Hondal mentioned that a virtual reality experience could be a potential solution as well. Committee Chair Lowell mentioned that she would like to take a moment to honor a developer who passed away, Tibor Hollo. She noted that his determination and vision helped build Miami into a world-class city. She mentioned that philanthropy was important to the Hollo family and noted that they have made a \$2.5 M donation to the Tibor and Sheila Hollo School of Real Estate at FIU Downtown on Brickell. She asked that everyone join in a moment of silence for Mr. Hollo.

AVP Cal presented the MMC land use. He commented that both sites 11 and 7 will be left open for the aquatic center on the master plan and that it will be open for public comment. Trustee Francesca Casanova commented that both sites offer various capabilities and echoed the comments made by Trustee Hondal regarding focusing on who will be using the pool. Trustee Sarnoff requested that there be a configuration with site 11 stretched 20 feet further west. Athletic Director Scott Carr commented that athletics will benefit from the aquatic center but that the campus community as a whole will have a greater benefit from it overall. AVP Cal commented that both locations of the aquatic center will be incorporated into the master plan for public comment. He noted that he predicts there will be more comments from the University community regarding the location of the aquatic center. He advised that on May 16th the advertisement would be submitted. AVP Cal mentioned that the Committee members are welcome to attend the public hearings of the Campus Master Plan. Committee Chair Lowell thanked the Committee, the University leadership, AVP Cal, Mr. Bob Griffith, the DLR group, and the Isaac Sports Group. She asked that unless any Ad Hoc Committee member has any objection, the draft 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan be released for the public hearing phase. She also noted that the 2015-2030 Campus Master Plan is expected to be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at the November 2024 meeting.

3. New Business *(If Any)*

No new business was raised.

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 Monday, May 6, 2024, at 1:28 PM.