Meeting Location: CBEIS – Room 235
Meeting Purpose: Morgan State University Master Plan Update – Steering Committee

Steering Committee Meeting
1. WTW Update on Facilities Master Plan progress
   a. Currently in Phase 2 - Concept Development of four phases
2. Discussion of Program Development and review of Program Summary handout
   a. Project Name and Type
b. Proposed Locations and Size

c. Current Sequencing/Phasing

3. Review of all proposed Program items: Demolition, New Construction and Renovation (major discussion points summarized below):

a. Technology Transfer Center should be called “Small Business Incubator”
   i. May not work in proposed Engineering location
   ii. Does not require “lab” or special space at this point – mostly offices
   iii. Could be located in a house or other small space, but should be close to the University
   iv. Could be grouped with Sponsored Programs and Grants
   v. Could be located at the Portage Avenue site

b. The Eatery North will be located on the Perring Parkway side of the pedestrian path due to site restrictions.

c. Students need more substantial interior recreation spaces
   i. The University needs an indoor track
   ii. Should support Division I indoor competitions
   iii. The plan should further pursue relationships between Hurt Gymnasium, Hill Field House and the proposed Wellness and Safety Center
      1. Wellness and Safety Center Option 3 successfully starts to create an entrance to campus and define an edge of campus along Stadium Way
      2. Future construction should not turn its back on Stadium Way, creating safety concerns by limiting visibility, or cause pedestrian and vehicular conflicts

d. The Health Center should be located closer to West Campus
   i. Possibly at the armory site
   ii. Possible acquisition of Northwood Shopping Center
   iii. Community outreach components must be considered
   iv. Possible synergies with Wellness and Safety Center

e. Tennis Courts are being repaired – long term plan should maintain 6-8 courts

f. Residence Hall locations need to be considered further
   i. Possible Living-Learning Honors community could be developed around Baldwin and Cummings
   ii. Possibly reuse O’Connell site for housing
   iii. Option 2 had the most positive review
      1. Must consider the campus edges, especially along Hillen Road
   iv. Consider campus life for residential and commuter students in the planning process
   v. It was suggested that residential uses should be relocated from Harper-Tubman in favor of academic uses

g. The University House site should consider zoning, parking and residential neighborhood scale
   i. Possible link to O’Connell site for visitor parking access

h. Discussion on athletic/rec field location:
   i. Value of land as building site vs. field?
   ii. South Campus could have positive synergies for rec fields
      1. Tennis courts with bleachers/stadium
      2. Rec field by Murphy would be good for marching band practice
   iii. A softball field will be developed at Murphy School site
   iv. ATTENTION: underground culvert in existing practice field area must be addressed

i. Future Science Complex planning must incorporate special needs, including the disposal of biological waste

j. Alumni House uses will be brought into main campus
   i. South Campus building will become vacant – consider for Physical Plant uses

k. Future Physical Plant development should consider including a Community Garden/Greenhouse
   i. Could include plant growth for campus-wide landscaping
I. Vehicular access must be maintained to Hill Field House
   i. Vehicular conflict with pedestrian spine extension to West Campus
   ii. Consider vehicular connection from Hillen Road entrance at Rawlings to Interfaith Chapel access

m. Aesthetic discussion:
   i. Academic Quad - most traditional
   ii. Morgan Commons – student services/activities area – modern with contextual materials
   iii. North and West Campuses – very modern with contextual materials
   iv. All development should consider more vertical development due to limited land
   v. Delineation between “architectural hubs” and background buildings

n. Consider visual separation between back-of-house Physical Plant uses and rest of campus
   i. Green space, landscaping cultivation area and/or green houses?

o. Discussion regarding Carter-Grant-Wilson renovation vs. demolition and replacement
   i. Interior must be renovated, but is exterior sufficient for long-term preservation?

p. West Campus should have a small University Police substation

4. Review Land Use organization options
   a. WTW presented three variations of possible Land Use options based on the Program options
   b. Maryanne Akers questioned if the program definition and land use organization were too rigid – perhaps a new strategy of mixed-use development should be considered, including academic, residential and student services
      i. Perhaps programs should not be developed around individual groups/schools/uses
      ii. References to Harvard and Florida A&M as possible precedents
      iii. Possibly conflicts with State of Maryland project approval process and financing
      iv. Steering Committee to meet NEXT WEEK to discuss preferred approach to future development and report back to the Planning Team
      v. O’Connell Hall could be possible site for mixed-use development

We are proceeding in accordance with the information stated above. Please notify WTW, in writing, if there are any corrections or additions to this report.

Prepared by:
WTW ARCHITECTS
Derek J. Eversmann, AICP, LEED AP
July 31, 2013

Distribution:
   Ms. Cynthia Graves-Wilder
   Ms. Mary Anne Akers
   Ms. Keia Butts
   Ms. Cynthia Linhart
   Mr. Robert Morelock
   Mr. Peter Forella
   Mr. Charlie Denney
   Mr. Stuart Sirota