Mission and Purpose of the Advisory Board
The Campus Planning Advisory Board (CPAB) is organized to advise the University’s decision makers concerning the utilization and development of the physical campus. The Board reviews proposals for new facilities and significant renovations or landscaping projects, and other matters related to the current and future utilization of the physical campus. The Board typically meets one or two times a semester for ninety minutes.

The CPAB web site is a helpful tool for members and the Brown community providing information and resources for further understanding of campus planning issues.
http://www.brown.edu/Administration/cpab/

Membership
The Board was chaired by Associate Provost Pamela O’Neil until September, 2009. Associate Provost Nancy Dunbar chaired the Board until February, 2010. Associate Provost Rod Beresford has chaired the Board since February, 2010. Until July, 2010 faculty members on the Board included William Heindel (Vice Chair), Joy Ko, and Steven Lubar. Staff members included Lisa Vaillancourt and Chris Beattie. Drew Madden was the undergraduate representative. The graduate student and medical student representatives were Stefanie Sevcik and Julia Heneghan. For the academic year 2010-2011 the faculty members are Steven Lubar (Vice Chair), Patricia Sobel, Arthur Landy, and James Allen. The staff representatives remain the same and the student representatives remain the same, except that Peter Johnson is now the undergraduate student representative.

Ex officio members of the Board are Stephen Maiorisi, Michael McCormick, Clifford Resnick, and Richard Spies.

Members have staggered terms so there is continuity and some institutional memory. Meetings are scheduled to accommodate project design review plans and member availability. Meeting dates are determined to assure that we have three or four faculty members and staff and student representation at each meeting.

Meeting Schedule for the 2008-2009 Academic Year
October 7, 2008
December 5, 2008
February 6, 2009
May 15, 2009
Focus of 2008-2009 Academic Year
The Board spent 2008-09 primarily focused on the redirection of the planning process toward restoration and renovation rather than new construction projects. The economic climate was discussed and Chair Pam O’Neil explained its effect on the development of capital projects. She explained that the plan now dictates that 50% of the funds for a project must be raised before approval of the design phase and 90% of the funds for a project must be in hand before commencement of the construction phase. Projects were also being prioritized in light of the economic situation.

Those construction projects already in various stages of development, such as the Stephen Robert Campus Center at Faunce House and Rhode Island Hall, were discussed and meetings featured visual presentations (schematics and models) by designers and Brown planners. Two projects of major interest to the Board were the renovation of Metcalf Chemistry and Metcalf Research to house the Department of Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences and the Department of Psychology, and the initial planning of the Medical Education Building. These projects were initially conceived as new buildings, but became renewal projects in response to the economic crisis.

Capital Projects — Design Reviews
Throughout the fall of 2008 and spring of 2009 the CPAB reviewed the latest design ideas for the following major capital projects.

- Stephen Robert Campus Center at Faunce House — This project is now completed. The CPAB played an important role in discussions regarding how the building would be used by the Brown community and in how it would change the dynamic of the Main Green. Mark Schatz and Kristen Giannattasio of Schwartz/Silver Architects gave a PowerPoint presentation and Board members had numerous comments and suggestions:
  - Members commented that opening up the first floor of Faunce House would be a great improvement.
  - There was concern that the main door to the building opened into the flow of foot traffic in the tunnel and that the door needed to be set back or there needed to sliding doors much like the entrance doors to J. Walter Wilson. Members asked the architects to think about this issue.
  - Members liked the idea of an electronic message board on the glass wall. Faunce Arch is a popular meeting spot, and messages could be displayed, as well as digital maps and perhaps a map showing where the shuttle was in real time.
  - Members suggested more outdoor seating on the Waterman side of the Arch, which would also increase interaction with J. Walter Wilson.
  - There was a suggestion to increase the no-parking zone on the Waterman side of the building
• **Medical Education Building** — Mike McCormick described the need for a new Medical Education Building in terms of the University’s plan to expand the size of the medical school class and to shift the Medical Education Building off College Hill towards the hospitals. The Jewelry District was a logical place to look for a possible site because of its proximity to downtown. Construction is now underway with an August, 2011 completion date. At the time, the design process had just started, and Mike McCormick gave a PowerPoint presentation on the adaptive reuse of 222 Richmond Street for the Medical Education Building. Ellenzweig was chosen to design the renewal and the cost will be approximately $45 million, versus $80 million for a new building. Highlights of the renewal include:
  - The previous façade was 70% glass. All the windows are being replaced with energy efficient windows to create an open, airy atmosphere.
  - The city is designing a park outside one side of the building.
  - Two lecture halls will be on the first floor, with seating for approximately 150 people each.
  - Case study rooms will be located on the second floor.
  - The top floor will house anatomy labs and seminar rooms (for 15-20 people).

Members of the Board discussed various aspects of the project. It was noted that the Med Ed Building would be half-way between campus and the hospital. There was concern about the self-contained nature of the site and that the building would be isolated from the hospital and the main campus. Members said that many resources needed to be on site — a library, librarians, a place to eat, fitness facilities, etc. There should be shuttle service to campus. If the med students live in the Jewelry District there will be much less connection to campus. Mike McCormick said that this building is the first step into the Jewelry District. The idea is to make sure that Jewelry District planning and the Medical Education Building planning complement one another, and interrelate with the larger city-private partnership.

• **Metcalf Renewal Project** — Construction is underway on this project as well, with a completion date of November, 2011. At the time, the University was just emerging from the feasibility study and starting the design process for using Metcalf Chemistry and Metcalf Research to house the departments that would have been in the Mind Brain Behavior Building. The cost of the renewal will be approximately $42 million versus $69 million for a new building. The scope of the project is similar to that of the recently renewed J. Walter Wilson Building. Leers Weinzapfel Associates is designing the renewal, expected to be a LEED Silver building with 30% less energy usage. Mike McCormick gave a PowerPoint presentation on some of the renewal goals, including:
  - Recapture the courtyard for social gathering and as a pass-through. Currently there are air conditioning units in this area.
  - Create a large, state-of-the-art lecture hall with an entrance on Thayer Street.
  - Take advantage of attic space by incorporating the spiral staircase and adding skylights for natural light.
  - Open the Lincoln Field entrance as the main entrance.

The former (and future) occupants of the building have had to relocate to leased space at 229 Waterman Street in the Wayland Square neighborhood for the duration of the project.
Major Planning Issues

- Planning Study for the Jewelry District — Richard Spies has been working on the knowledge-based economy initiative and Francis Halsband is leading the planning study to articulate a long term vision for future development. The Rhode Island economy is struggling, with the exception of education and health care, and the Jewelry District is a physical area where growth can occur. Members of the Board supported the development of the area and expressed the idea that growth would be an exciting opportunity for all the participants to create a new place with its own character. The renewal of a historic building is a first big step, and members expressed how important it will be to build a connection between the Jewelry District and the main campus.

Focus of 2009-2010 Academic Year
During 2009-2010 the board continued its review of the projects described above, which were beginning to enter the construction phase, continued its discussion of the Jewelry District planning, and focused on Integrated Facilities Planning — a discussion of capital investments, renewal projects, and maintenance costs.

- Planning Study for the Jewelry District (cont.’d) — Richard Spies noted that people on the CPAB have a great perspective and the members’ input is greatly appreciated. Student members voiced concerns about the new medical school building being located in the Jewelry District. Safety was and continues to be a concern, as is the increased need for easy transportation to the main campus. Members of the board also agreed that there needs to be a central gathering place in the Jewelry District for medical students to congregate and feel comfortable. The development of the Jewelry District is an important aspect of the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Expansion off College Hill is absolutely necessary as the PAE comes to fruition.

- Integrated Facilities Planning (Sightlines Building Portfolio Discussion) — The CPAB members were briefed by Mike McCormick on the results of a comprehensive facilities renewal study conducted by consultants (Sightlines of Guilford, CT). Every building on campus has been evaluated in terms of specific repairs and modernization needs, leading to a “net asset value” or NAV, which gives a percentage “as good as new” rating for each structure, as well as a dollar figure representing the cost of all of the projects needed to bring the building up to 100% as good as new. The Brown campus as a whole is at 83%, which is in the middle of the values for a peer group of campuses, that is, a selection of physically (rather than academically) comparable universities. The cost of all renewal needs of current buildings is staggering — about $416 million over the next ten years (the Brown campus “replacement value” is about $2.2 billion). The real value of this type of study was described to lie in the ability to focus attention on specific building portfolios (academic high-tech, academic low-tech, administrative and support, student life, dormitories, and so on) and on buildings that have low NAV. Once a building’s NAV drops below about 75%, rapid deterioration usually follows, and renewal (or removal) becomes mandatory. The members discussed the prioritizing of academic and high tech needs with dormitory updates, auxiliary
housing needs, etc., as well as modernization needs (upgrading before things break) versus repair and maintenance (addressing existing problems). The Sightlines study results enable Brown to compare the costs of various renewal strategies: for example, the “steady-state” investment needed to maintain the current 83% NAV is about $37 million annually, whereas the “equilibrium” investment based on building life cycle needs would be about $69 million annually, and would lift the NAV to about 90% over five years. The Board noted that historically Brown has approached renewal mostly through major capital projects, and that its annual renewal investments of $5 million to $10 million are inadequate to the needs identified through this study.

- Michael McCormick reviewed the projects in the construction phase — The Granoff Creative Arts Center, The Stephen Robert Campus Center, the Metcalf renovation, and the Fitness and Aquatics Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Rod Beresford, Chair
Steven Lubar, Vice Chair