CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors approve the campus master plan and its use as a guide for campus development over the next ten years.

Background and Project Description

In June 2018 the Board of Governors approved the expenditure of University funds to hire a consultant team to undertake a new quantitatively based campus master plan with a ten year planning horizon with two year and five year increments.

The consultant team began their work in August of 2018 and over the past ten months, the team has engaged with more than 900 individuals through surveys, focus groups, public forums, media and one-on-one conversations. Along with a comprehensive space utilization analysis, the process has resulted in the development of a number of organizing ideas and strategic goals that will guide the University through the coming years.

Strategies:
- Organize the core campus and make it more welcoming
- Concentrate academic activity in an enhanced core
- Define key sites for future development, promote optionality for the Health Sciences, and focus the university’s real estate strategy

The core of the framework set forth by the master plan is consolidation within the academic core and a focus of resources and investment in order to support the University’s vision and mission. The attached document “The Wayne Framework” summarizes the key findings and recommendations.
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The Wayne Framework

Purpose
Wayne State University’s new campus plan provides a framework to guide decision making around the university’s physical environment. It consists of three primary components:

- Important data sets and resulting analytics, most importantly on the use of existing space and the current condition of university buildings, and web-based mapping tools that promote data visualization and communication;
- Physical strategies and principles that better organize the campus; prioritize and direct capital investment; suggest near-term demolitions, renovations, and site improvements; make the campus more welcoming and inclusive for students, faculty, staff, and the community; and maximize future flexibility by providing options for long-term on-campus development;
- Organizational structures that promote integrated decision making within the university and better connect the university with its external community so as to allow for meaningful and sustained engagement.

Key findings
In order to better inform future decision making, the master plan organized and analyzed a number of important data sets. The key findings from this analysis include:

- The space utilization analysis showed significant softness in the university’s use of existing space:
  - Classroom use for scheduled instruction has an evening peak, but even at this peak only approximately 60% of all classrooms are in use (this analysis predates the opening of the new Ilitch School of Business which contains a large number of additional classrooms and demonstrated soft usage in Fall 2019). The university’s overall classroom metric (the ratio of classroom demand to classroom supply assuming a minimum target of 40 hours of weekly room use for scheduled instruction) is 0.259 (the state systems which have officially adopted this classroom metric typically target scores of 0.400 to 0.700). There is therefore significant capacity to either increase the number of sections delivered, or to decrease available classroom space.
  - Teaching laboratories show a somewhat soft utilization profile, except for core science courses in biology, chemistry, and physics.
  - Research space use, as measured by sponsored expenditures, is currently dominated by the School of Medicine, although even for the School of Medicine this utilization is not equally strong across all research-intensive buildings. In particular, Scott Hall is under-utilized from a sponsored expenditures perspective.
Office space utilization is likely also soft. While the best available calculation of the vacancy rate is ~9.3% (i.e. reasonable), an investigation of office configurations suggests significant inequities and likely wasted space. The average size for private offices varies widely across colleges and administrative units, from approximately 85 square feet per person to almost 180 square feet per person, with 20 of the 36 units surveyed having an average above 120 square feet (typical targets are between 100 and 120 square feet). The available data for shared work spaces is even more stark. Unit averages vary from ~25 square feet per person to ~175 square feet, with 12 of 31 units surveyed averaging above 85 square feet per person (targets go from 60 to 85 square feet). Despite the fact that office space is the single largest category of university space, the university does not have a central database for tracking station counts or occupancies. Improved management of this space type represents a significant value proposition.

The university has over 400,000 assignable square feet of library and study space which represents a significant percentage of its academic portfolio.

- As a result of opportunistic program moves, several colleges (Liberal Arts and Science, Engineering, Fine and Performing Arts, Medicine, etc.), and even individual departments within these colleges, are widely distributed across campus. This distribution limits opportunities for formal and informal collaboration and creates logistical issues for students and faculty, resulting in an inefficient distribution of resources.

- The condition of university buildings and the university’s growing deferred maintenance liability represent a clear and present danger to its ability to deliver on its mission. Before the master plan began, the best available estimate of the university’s 10-year capital renewal need was calculated by Sightlines at approximately $1.1 billion. As part of the master plan, we undertook a more detailed examination of 24 buildings, analyzing the condition of their plumbing, electrical, fire protection, and HVAC systems. 14 of the 24 buildings were rated “poor,” which means they have multiple individual systems that are unreliable and require a major renovation. 7 of the 24 buildings generated ratings of “unreliable,” which means the majority of their individual systems are unreliable and the replacement/renovation need is immediate. Moreover, a comparison of our more detailed building evaluations and the Sightlines scores strongly suggests the Sightlines $1.1 billion estimate significantly undercounts the true liability.

- The campus does not present a clear, welcoming, and neighborly face to the city, abutting neighborhoods, and university visitors.

- Within the campus, open space is not optimally organized so as to provide connections between campus districts, promote a vibrant atmosphere by activating and engaging with building edges, or result in flexible usable open space for student and campus activities, both programmed and spontaneous.
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- Accident data shows that Warren Avenue and Anthony Wayne Drive are significant safety concerns. Furthermore, these streets have more travel lanes than are needed given the amount of traffic they carry.
- The university is well supplied with parking. Approximately 2,000 spaces are currently empty at peak use times (although this parking supply is distributed across the university’s geography and some stakeholders may find the walk from available parking inconvenient).

**Physical strategies**

The master plan focuses on three key physical strategies:

- **Organize the core campus and make it more welcoming:**
  - **Category 1: Civic space**
    - Enhance Gullen Mall by moving circulation to the building edges and creating usable green space in the center of the mall. Extend Gullen Mall across Warren Avenue by closing an additional block of 2nd Avenue to vehicular traffic (to Hancock Street). Gullen Mall and 2nd Avenue should function as the internal pedestrian and student-oriented campus “main street.”
    - Make Cass Avenue into a true civic corridor where the university and the city blend and merge. The primary methods for accomplishing this should be to further enhance the street’s multi-modal character, and to more uniformly promote active mixed-use ground floor uses with an emphasis on appropriate retail, campus/community common workspace, and arts-related venues.
    - Embrace the east-west cultural axis and extend the area now under investigation via the DIA Plaza and Midtown Cultural Connections design competition onto and through the campus, extending all the way to the new Anthony Wayne Drive Apartments. Reimagining Keast Commons, Fountain Court, and the west plaza between the Prentis Building and the Detroit Public Library as major open spaces along this axis should be priority investments.
  - **Category 2: Street function and character enhancement**
    - Reconfigure Warren Avenue by reducing the current eight-lane configuration (110’) to five lanes (73’) with a pedestrian-only signal at the newly extended Gullen Mall crossing.
    - Reconfigure Anthony Wayne Drive by reducing the current eight-lane configuration to four lanes, and growing the median so that it becomes a usable and programmable open space. Further improve traffic flows in this area by making the Lodge Service Drive and Palmer Avenue two-way.
Consider options to deck I-94 so as to bridge the divide between the core campus and iBio/Techtown. A full deck would generate the capacity to build approximately 650,000 square feet. If this is not possible, a reduced option that establishes street presence on Second Avenue and Cass Avenue could still offer approximately 450,000 square feet of development potential.

Better connect the core campus with the athletics district by creating a pedestrian path following the former Putnam Street, and explore options to relocate the existing pedestrian bridge crossing the Lodge at this alignment.

Category 3: Campus gateway districts

- Improve the major campus gateways at Cass Avenue/Canfield Street and at Woodward Avenue/I-94. These should become major active mixed-use nodes supporting university residential life (juniors and seniors would be well-suited to the southern gateway; graduate, professional students, and potentially faculty and market-rate options to the northern gateway) through appropriate partnerships. The crucial Woodward Avenue/Warren Avenue parcel should also be improved as a major future university development site (likely with a community-oriented use) when an appropriate program can be identified. Meanwhile, the site should have an upgraded temporary landscape treatment.
- Create and implement a district lighting strategy that makes the core campus feel safe, welcoming, and inviting at all times of day.

- **Near-term, concentrate academic activity in an enhanced core**
  - Optimize program locations and consolidate dispersed colleges. Focus instructional activity in a renovated State Hall that caters to a wide-range of pedagogies and provides excellent facilities for general-purpose teaching and learning. Rethink the Purdy-Kresge complex so as to better support student study and collaboration, and to consolidate university collections (potentially with an on- or off-site remote retrieval system), and library administration; and explore enhanced partnership opportunities with the Detroit Public Library. Concentrate College of Fine and Performing Arts uses in Old Main, and consider the viability of a focused Arts district around Old Main and the Hillberry Theater (with other arts uses along Cass Avenue). Consider repurposing the majority of the Undergraduate Library for academic uses, primarily centered on the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (particularly language and humanities programs) and the Honors College. Consider repurposing the Faculty Administration Building for academic departmental uses, relocating administrative functions, including the president’s and provost’s offices, to the Macabees Building (5057 Woodward). Consider appropriate reuse strategies for the many smaller
houses and facilities under university control, including for childcare, a faculty club, and other identified uses.

- Reduce the university’s building portfolio. The successful execution of the various move sequences outlined in the master plan should allow the university to empty Manoogian Hall, General Lectures, the atrium portion of the Undergraduate Library, and Shapero Hall. With the possible exception of Shapero (the university will need to weigh the contribution of the building’s architecture against the reinvestment need mandated by its poor systems), these buildings should be demolished. In addition, Life Sciences should be evaluated, and a cost comparison made of renovation vs. replacement (preliminary investigations suggest replacement will be more cost-effective). In total, the university could eliminate 320,000 to 420,000 gross square feet. This will allow approximately $4 million to be reallocated annually to improve the level of service in remaining buildings (current operations and maintenance budgets are significantly below industry standards), and have a significant impact on the university’s capital renewal needs, enabling it to better focus its capital renewal dollars. Note that these proposed demolitions are not a judgement of any of the important program uses currently in the targeted buildings. These will all need to be relocated (and provided with better space), with the exception of classroom space (of which the university has an over-supply) and some student study space (which can be improved qualitatively and potentially expanded through partnership with the Detroit Public Library).

- When possible, the Prentis Building should be repurposed as a community-oriented building and important campus gateway.

- Define key sites for future development, promote optionality for the Health Sciences, and focus the university’s real estate strategy

- The master plan supports the health sciences by detailing multiple options. The plan describes how the health sciences could remain in place or relocate wholesale. It details how a relocation could be determined based on various strategies: reinforcing iBio, bridging the gap between the core campus and northern programs/connections, better leveraging collaborations with the College of Engineering, and working with future potential clinical partners.

- The master plan does make a formal recommendation on Scott Hall. Because Scott Hall is an inefficient building (it yields only 264,000 assignable square feet from its 500,000 gross square feet for an efficiency factor of 52% compared to a likely 60% efficiency achievable through new construction), averages only $142 of sponsored expenditures per research square foot, and would likely cost in the region of $300 million to renovate, the master plan recommends the building be replaced (and likely not on a
one-for-one square-foot basis). Given that opening a replacement building will take time, some additional investment in Scott Hall may be necessary, but this investment should be reduced to a minimum.

- In addition to the sites identified as potential locations for the health sciences, the university has additional infill capacity on the core campus. While the near-term strategy for the master plan focuses on consolidation, the long-term idea is to secure the university’s future by providing for growth when it becomes needed. The master plan therefore identifies a minimum of 2.3 million square feet of development capacity within the core (assuming very modest densities that could likely be further intensified). Whenever possible, future program growth should therefore not be distributed outside the core campus (unless the health sciences remain in their current location).

- As a corollary to this, the university should focus its real estate strategy between the Lodge and Woodward Avenue after maximizing the development opportunities on the identified parcels within the district. We also recommend deaccessioning properties outside of these bounds (with the exception of the athletics district and the health sciences if they remain in place).

**Implementation**

The Capital Prioritization and Planning Committee will be the long-term stewards of the master plan. They represent an integrated group, able to assess and prioritize university needs holistically and analytically. Over time, the university should continue to assess the membership of this group to ensure it broadly represents appropriate internal stakeholders. The committee should be staffed through Planning and Space Management, which should become the centralized home for all university place-making initiatives.

In order to support ongoing decision making, Planning and Space Management will need to carefully consider its data management practices, and will likely need to make technology investments to ensure the Capital Prioritization and Planning Committee is well-informed. These investments are high-value and should be prioritized. Similarly, Planning and Space Management should consider appropriate detailed follow-on studies to optimize the program relocations envisaged by the master plan (these might include college-based master plans for the most affected colleges like: Liberal Arts and Sciences, Fine and Performing Arts, Engineering, etc.).

The university should also create a forum for ongoing community engagement. This input has been a defining feature of the plan, and revealed strong community support for the university, a desire to better understand the university’s activities, and a hope for increased participation in campus life. This process will be most productive if the university consolidates its community engagement functions in two offices: the Honors
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College (for academic activity) and the Office of Government and Community Affairs (for administrative activity).

Finally, the master plan provides planning-level cost estimates for implementation, and an assessment of the relative cost of its proposals vs. the minimum capital renewal investments described by Sightlines. The planning-level estimates suggest the capital cost of the consolidation components of the master plan (i.e. the 10-15 year strategy) likely has a net present value of approximately $500,000,000 exclusive of site and roadway improvements, and exclusive of any health sciences investment (i.e. this figure does not include a replacement of Scott Hall). The analysis further suggests this figure is likely similar to the 10-year capital renewal and modernization target established by Sightlines for the affected buildings; i.e.: assuming the monies are available, there likely is no significant difference between implementing the master plan vision and simply addressing deferred maintenance in the identified buildings. Note that this figure does not include the sizable capital renewal needs of the university’s other buildings.