

*Minutes approved as corrected (red notations) at May 19, 2005 meeting*

**Campus Planning Steering Committee  
Thursday, April 21, 2005  
8:00-9:30 am  
3190 Grainger Hall**

**Committee Members – Present**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Department Represented</b>
Dean Elton Aberle	CALS, Chancellor's Appointee
Mary Behan	University Committee
Connie Brachman	Space & Remodeling Policies Committee
<b>John Chadima</b>	<b>Athletics</b>
Alan Fish	Facilities Planning and Management
Sandra Guthrie	Recreational Sports Committee
Dean Michael Knetter <sup>(sub)</sup>	School of Business, Chancellor's Appointee (non-voting sub for Michael Knetter =Melissa Amos-Landgraf)
Frank Kooistra	Academic Staff
Robert McMahon	Physical Sciences Division
Cyrena Pondrom	Humanities Division
Ken Potter	Environmental Representative
Terri Reda	UW System
Provost Peter Spear	Chair, Chancellor's Designee
Brenda Spychalla	Information Technology Committee
Troy Vosseller	Associated Students of Madison

**Committee Members – Absent**

**\*Absence indicated in advance**

Michael Gould	Biological Sciences Division
Evelyn Howell	Arboretum Committee
Ann Hoyt*	Social Studies Division
Anne Lundin*	Library Committee
Brian Ohm	Transportation Board
Chris Richards*	UW Foundation
Dean Gary Sandefur*	Letters & Science, Chancellor's Appointee
Mark Wells	Medical School
Terry Wilkerson	UW Hospital and Clinics

**Also in Attendance**

Teresa Adams	FP&M, Capital Budget
LaMarr Billups	Chancellor's Office
Gail Bliss	DOA, Division of State Facilities
Chris Bruhn	Letters & Science, Facilities

Sam Calvin	DOA, Division of State Facilities
Dave Drummond	FP&M, Safety
Daniel Einstein	FP&M, Physical Plant
Steve Harman	FP&M, Major Projects
John Harrod	FP&M, Physical Plant
Ann Hayes	FP&M, Major Projects
Pete Heaslett	FP&M, Major Projects
Rob Kennedy	FP&M, Transportation Planning
Todd Kuschel	University Police
Doug Rose	FP&M, Space Management
Dwayne Sackman	University Health Services
Eb Schubert	FP&M, Space Management
John Smith	Division of Information Technology
Dorothy Steele	FP&M, Administration
Bill Zimmerman	Division of Information Technology

**Peter Spear** called the meeting to order at 8:05 am. The March 3, 2005 minutes were approved as submitted.

**Spear** said that today's meeting will focus on the phasing of the master plan and begin to look at design guidelines.

**Alan Fish** gave update on progress overall. He showed existing and proposed buildings, and talked about how we will divide these projects into three six-year timelines, over 18 years, and then everything out past 18 years.

Starting with the East campus pedestrian mall, **Fish** indicated that the Park St and Dayton Street residence halls are shown as existing because one is under construction, and another is already approved. He went through the potential concepts/buildings currently being considered, pointing them out on the draft plan and explaining that sequencing will be important.

**Luanne Greene** gave a quick overview of utilities plan, by zones.

**Fish** mentioned that we are just opening the Co-Gen plant, and says that this will give us enough capacity for at least the next decade. If we do make any changes to the other utilities, it won't be due to capacity needs, but to a desire for new technology that is cleaner and/or saves more money. We don't intend to have another power plant site on campus. We might want to put an electric substation on campus, so that we can buy electric power from the grid, and distribute it ourselves. We might be able to save some money this way. This approach might mean that we would need to site 4 new electric substations. We will investigate this.

**Greene** noted that refining the plan and getting the phasing down are what they will be doing for the next month. They will also consider how utilities and parking will relate to the phasing.

**Brenda Spychalla** asked about the thinking regarding shifting the Art program from the center of campus to the warehouse near the Kohl Center. **Fish** answered that the studio art (glass, foundry) had to move there, and soon other programs would have needed to move while their buildings would be renovated, so why not put them all together at the same time? The idea came from the Art Department. There may be an option to put the gallery space and faculty offices elsewhere. They don't know yet, and are still testing ideas.

**Cyrena Pondrom** said that the thought of putting languages and humanities south of the business school would not be a good idea, as it would be putting languages all over the map, and that it would have a negative impact on L&S.

**Rose Barroilhet** said that the challenge is that L&S is half of the University. L&S said that they would prefer to be near History. Since we're looking at a whole city block, a lot of these programs could be put together in that one space.

**Alan Fish** was quoted in the paper as saying that Athletics is considering buying back the Camp Randall athletic center. **Ken Potter** said that this would displace a lot of people, faculty & staff especially. **Fish** said that Recreational Sports is thinking of expanding the Natatorium first. Recreational Sports is doing a master plan. **Sandy Guthrie** said that she felt Fish had said it all and agreed with him. These discussions are very, very preliminary. Potter noted that he hadn't heard of any discussions yet.

**Spear** asked about the Madison Metropolitan School District site. Is there a building there? **Fish** said that there are actually 2 huge power lines underground there, making it NOT a great buildable site. Currently the Madison Metropolitan School District building is not within the campus boundary. We might need to reconsider our boundary at some point.

**Gary Brown** presented about the current phasing plan for the next 18 years and beyond. We have to consider square footage of footprints and building heights, as proposed in the current draft plan. We need to think about what can fit where. It's like a three dimensional chess game. As you move each thing, it causes ripples of effects on other projects.

Brown described the current draft plan in three six-year plan phases. This will clearly change as we go along. It's important to note that this is still a draft. Brown also described phasing for almost a million square feet of expansion room, for uses that are currently unassigned.

**Brown** asked if there were questions. **Spear** asked if there are estimates of square footages, including the dollar amounts?

**Barroilhet** said that the full build-out will give about six million gross square feet. We will be demolishing about two and a half million gross square feet. There will be a net gain of about **three** and a half million gross square feet.

**Sandy Guthrie** said that Middleton library was scheduled to be demolished in the last master plan. She isn't clear now. **Brown** said it will be removed.

**Greene** said that we have to balance the parking needs in the sequencing, and asked the committee if they thought the Biotron site is an appropriate site for a large parking structure. Should the Biotron site be an academic site or a parking site?

**Brown** said that we may be able to add 150 spaces to Steenbock's ramp with an additional 2 floors. **Greene** said that we need to pay attention to total quantity and reasonable locations. Adjacencies count. Dimensionally, the Biotron site is a big, wide site. Flexible enough for parking or for wet lab site.

**Spear** asked how it might affect traffic flow. **Greene** said there wouldn't be a net increase in parking, just a relocation of Lot 62 capacity.

**Terri Reda** said that the traffic/transit issues (light rail, etc.) will make a difference in this discussion of siting parking.

**Brown** said that we've been working closely with Madison Metro. **Alan Fish** is on the Mayor's trolley committee and **Rob Kennedy** will be working with this too. We will be having a less distributed and more concentrated parking situation. Transit and its capacity will be important. Commuter bus lines and Park & Rides with express bus lines could become important. We'll probably share more on this next month.

**Brown** asked if there were any other questions on the Phasing. Since there weren't, the discussion moved to Design Guidelines.

**Greene** presented an introduction to the development of Design Guidelines. They need feedback as they get started.

**Greene** asked a series of questions. What does a campus plan need to answer? What should it look like? She referred back to UW's Planning Principles. We've been making aesthetic judgments all along, even with siting, etc. Now, we want to turn to refining the design guidelines. Design Guidelines are not a cookbook and are not intended to limit creativity. They are meant to transmit what you believe in and what you want your place to be like.

**Greene** said that Design Guidelines describe what the buildings and very importantly what the grounds should look like. She presented the lists and slides of "top buildings" and "bottom buildings," and noted that not everyone agrees. This "Top Buildings/Bottom Buildings" process is not about consensus, just about collecting input

and generating discussion. A lot of the top buildings are the historic buildings. What makes them top buildings? Residential scale for some; iconic status for others.

**Spear** asked whether people like these because of the design features or because of the nostalgic associations. When the new Chemistry building addition was shown in the top building list, several members of the CPSC seemed to disagree with this assessment.

**Greene** talked about the attitudes toward site, and how the buildings shapes and facades should be formed. She commented on the preference for buildings that feature natural, local warm materials. She said that they had received many comments about windows and their placement. She mentioned that another issue affecting how people do or don't like buildings involved how the scale and proportion of the building relates to scale of human beings. Entries and arrival points are important. She introduced a concept that ASG calls "Heroes & good soldiers." This concept asks, "What is the meaning and use of buildings?" We need some higher design buildings and others that need to be quiet and mainly help form the outside space. This is not about good or bad design...just which is most prominent. **Brown** pointed out how the angle at which the Law Building is built. It's slightly angled off of the axis of Bascom Hill walkways. It vaguely makes you feel that something is wrong.

**Greene** then showed the "bottom buildings" list. **Greene** talked about rhythm and proportion. Memorial Library was controversial as to whether it should be on this list. **Greene** said maybe it underperforms relative to its neighbors: State Historical Society, Memorial Union and the Red Gym.

**Greene** asked for comments, "How do you want this to turn out? What do you want this place to look like?"

**Kooistra** asked how many of these buildings are on the removal list? **Barroilhet** said a lot (about 20 buildings). **Greene** pointed out that being ugly was not enough to make it onto the demolition list. **Fish** said that the operational aspect was the criteria for the first cut, and the architectural aspect was last.

**Guthrie** asked how Memorial Library could be on the bad list, but Helen C. White not be on that same list. (This gets back to functional character of the building and how the current program "works" in the building or not.)

**Mary Behan** asked how all the buildings on the bad list were built. She pointed out that they are from an era where people didn't care less about design than we do. She asked "How could this happen?" **Fish** pointed out that we built 50 buildings in one decade. We built fast and cheap in response to the huge influx of the Baby Boom. **Greene** pointed out that in the Sputnik era, campuses all over the country built fast and cheap. WWII changed everything from the point of view of architects; she gave the example of the Bauhaus movement in architecture. There was a reaction against the classical architecture style, since it had been adopted by the Nazis. The field of architecture reacted bitterly against it.

**Behan** wanted to know if we could be assured that we won't do it again. **Greene** said this is exactly why we are doing Design Guidelines.

**Pondrom** wants to make sure that buildings replicate or compromise with their neighbors. She wants no buildings like the UW Foundation building that "scream at their neighbors." She doesn't like the "Brutalist" design on interiors of buildings. Don't treat the interiors worse than the exteriors, with bare wires, etc.

**Bob McMahon** is concerned about siting and setbacks. Don't squeeze buildings into places that will take space out of sidewalks for pedestrians & bikes. **Greene** said that in the design of any individual building, generally the users of the building will push to make the highest "yield" in the program of the buildings. It is up to everyone on committees like the Campus Planning Committee to keep the greater good of the overall campus in mind. **Ken Saiki** has been reminding us of the importance of large trees. You need the setbacks to be able to get trees to take hold so that they can eventually become large trees.

**Spychalla** said that she loves the red clay roofs – they tie things together. **Brown** asked if all the buildings should have red tile. Should there be a mix? Should they be similar? **Fish** asked if they should be in a neighborhood.

**Pondrom** asked if it's too expensive for us to use natural stone. **Fish** said that we have been trying to include this in projects. We need to be able to blend architectural pre-cast with stone and brick elements. **Brown** pointed out that the sandstone quarried locally for a lot of the older buildings is a soft stone and is now deteriorating. It's also all quarried out now. We may use kasota stone, which looks similar but comes from Minnesota.

**Guthrie** noted that the malls on campus serve a very important purpose.

**Troy Vosseller** mentioned that he likes the new crew house. He likes the horizontal windows.

**Reda** pointed out that when we did the walks through campus, people noted that we always were commenting that we felt that we were at the back doors of buildings. **Fish** agreed and said that it's also important to denote the service and loading areas.

**Reda** asked if we will be continuing the distribution of supplies from a remote warehouse, where we bring deliveries into campus on smaller trucks, rather than in semis. **Fish** said that we are fighting to maintain that.

**McMahon** pointed out that in lab buildings, there is a lot of stuff on the roof. He said that there is a real consequence to cutting corners on screening these mechanicals.

**Greene** pointed out that there is a difference in taller vs. shorter buildings and what sort of roof is important.

**Reda** asked if there should be some design guidelines set for basements. Sometimes places that are designed for storage end up being renovated for programmatic needs. Should there be some standards to be able to anticipate this? **Greene** wasn't sure if that is the level of detail. Humans like to be near light, so that might be a base standard in this regard.

**Pondrom** pointed out that Van Hise and Van Vleck have the two best views available. Are we keeping this in mind? Van Hise is on the demolition list. **Greene** said that there will be tall buildings on campus, especially in the east campus. The Van Hise site is not appropriate for something that tall. That neighborhood will have a different character.

**Greene** said that we must embrace South campus as an urban campus. We need to make it an excellent space. Beauty is not alien to cities. The current context is not beautiful down there. We need to create iconic spaces.

**Spear** asked what she means by urban spaces. **Greene** said that there is less open space, but streetscapes and trees are important. How do we treat the first floor? How do you feel when you're in these places? How do you keep it activated and not dead?

**Saiki** pointed out that there are so many cars that go through the south campus.

**Behan** said that someone mentioned to her that the campus seems unfriendly to people coming into Madison to get to the hospital, etc. These people may be very stressed. They need clear signage and need to know where to park. The current design is unfair to them.

**Brown** mentioned that we will be building a new visitor welcome center. **Spear** pointed out that we have discussed the idea of entrance signage before. We didn't do anything because of the cost, but the problem has not gone away. One example is the annual Forensics Tournament – a parent said that they didn't know how to get their child to the place where their Forensics meet would be held, nor did they know where they could park. The place needs to be friendlier.

**Fish** introduced our new campus architect, **Daniel Okoli**, and mentioned that he will be starting in July, but will be joining us periodically until then.

**Spear** adjourned the meeting at 9:19 am.