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Why have a presentation?

- A year of reflection, lessons learned & refinements
- Discussion of new initiatives
- Campus Master Plan Implications on Project Management
- New People
Goal

To fully integrate projects with overall campus planning objectives and to maximize the opportunities for elevating the quality of the built and natural environment.
Last Discussion (May 2008)

Project Development Process
  Needs Assessment
  Alternative Analysis
  Site Selection
  Preferred Alternative

A/E Selection Process
  Focus on Design Ability in Stage One, Technical in Stage two

Standard Contracts

Design Process

3 Pre-Schematics
Lessons Learned

- A/E Selection Process
  - Better explanation of the evaluation process to stakeholders at the start
  - Better definition of evaluation team members necessary
    - Letters of Appointment
  - We are making excellent progress

- Design Process
  - Manage to contract
  - What three pre-schematics mean?
    - Cost Estimate - Energy Analysis
Agenda

- Lessons Learned
- Architectural Advisory Committee Review Enhancements
- Future Objectives
- Campus Master Plan & Project Management
- Open Discussion
Architectural Advisory Committee Review Enhancement

- Funded centrally through PPD

- Incremental design reviews at pre-schematics & final schematics

- Iterative design discussion
Future Objectives

- Development and maintenance of standard Concept Study Contract
- Development of Renovation Design Contract
- Development of a programmatic view on historic preservation
- Update of the Project Managers’ Handbook
- Development of A/E negotiation process
A/E Negotiation Process

- Effort Based opposed to percentage
  - Requires standardized scope of services
  - Calculation of design phase durations
  - Probable team composition
  - Indexed to overall cost of construction and building type complexity
  - Important to protect against front loading
  - More credible negotiations
Historic Preservation

- Three Tier Classification System:
  - Building & Public Area Assessment and Classification
  - Classification of Building Zones
  - Classification of Critical Building Elements
  - Calibrated treatment based on significance & condition
  - Facilitates proper budgeting & approvals
  - Facilitates programmatic budgeting & prioritization
Campus Master Plan

- Parts I & II
- Precinct Plans
  - Massing
  - Relationships
- Site Development Guidelines
  - Approved by the Trustees
Core Campus Precinct
Summary of General Guidelines

To ensure the integration and vitality of future growth across Core Campus, the quality of the public realm is prioritized as the critical framework to knit the campus together. Proposed development, studied at the scale of individual zones, is often defined by new formal green spaces with interconnecting pedestrian paths that will become equally dynamic complements to the established green spaces of the original campus. Located at the midpoint of campus, the most significant of these greens, “Alumni Quad”, will physically and programmatically unite east and west as a destination for outdoor interaction.

The Plan seeks to reinforce the axiomatic organization of Cornell’s campus, which establishes formal geometric order while at the same time welcoming the surrounding natural landscape as it transitions to traditional quad commons. This concept supports the restoration of Wee Stinky Glen as it diagonally negotiates the topography of the undergraduate-focused “West Center” up and into the Ag Quad, as well as the establishment of a corresponding natural greenway interwoven through East Campus.

Throughout Core Campus, the proposed configuration of the ground floor spaces is intended to enhance academic and social engagement, and to that end, significant areas on the ground floors adjacent to the exterior green spaces should be devoted to public space and activated with transparent facades. Buildings, particularly large academic buildings, should be oriented to main pedestrian routes and major open spaces, providing two or more “front” doors and maximizing porosity on the ground floor. Many new buildings, particularly those fronting the proposed East Center Green and Mid-Campus Walk, will be required to provide active uses on the ground floor, such as lounges, dining facilities, social hubs and external corridors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel Footprint (ft²)</th>
<th>Building Footprint (ft²)</th>
<th>% Parcel Coverage</th>
<th>Height (range in stories)</th>
<th>Potential GSF (range in ft²)</th>
<th>Potential units per acre (residential)</th>
<th>Number of Units (residential)</th>
<th>Permitted Uses (required uses in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1A</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4 (match Olive Tjaden Hall)</td>
<td>34,800 – 34,800</td>
<td>• Academic</td>
<td>• Academic</td>
<td>• below-grade parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1B</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3 (Match Sibley Hall)</td>
<td>64,800 – 64,800</td>
<td>• Academic</td>
<td>• Academic</td>
<td>• Social/cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td>30,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,600 – 99,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion