

DRAFT

Campus Planning Steering Committee

May 19, 2005

8:00-9:30 am

Room 3190, Grainger Hall

Committee Members – Present

Name	Department Represented
Dean Elton Aberle	CALS, Chancellor's Appointee
Mary Behan	University Committee
Connie Brachman	Space & Remodeling Policies Committee
John Chadima	Athletics
Alan Fish	Facilities Planning and Management
Sandra Guthrie	Recreational Sports Committee
Evelyn Howell	Arboretum Committee
Ann Hoyt	Social Studies Division
Frank Kooistra	Academic Staff
Robert McMahon	Physical Sciences Division
Cyrena Pondrom	Humanities Division
Ken Potter	Environmental Representative
Terri Reda	UW System
Chris Richards	UW Foundation
Provost Peter Spear	Chair, Chancellor's Designee
Brenda Spychalla	Information Technology Committee

Committee Members – Absent

***Absence indicated in advance**

Michael Gould	Biological Sciences Division
Dean Michael Knetter	School of Business, Chancellor's Appointee
Anne Lundin*	Library Committee
Brian Ohm	Transportation Board
Dean Gary Sandefur	Letters & Science, Chancellor's Appointee
Troy Vosseler	Associated Students of Madison (<i>classes out of session</i>)
Mark Wells	Medical School
Terry Wilkerson	UW Hospital and Clinics

Also in Attendance

Teresa Adams	FP&M, Capital Budget
Rose Barroilhet	FP&M, Capital Budget
Alan Bessey	FP&M, Planning and Landscape Architecture
Gary Brown	FP&M, Planning and Landscape Architecture
Chris Bruhn	Letters & Science, Facilities

Sam Calvin	DOA/DSF
Dave Drummond	FP&M, Safety
Gwen Drury	FP&M, Planning & Landscape Architecture
Julie Grove	FP&M, Major Projects
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
Lance Lunsway	FP&M, Transportation Services
Dan Okoli	FP&M, University Architect/Major Projects
Doug Sabatke	FP&M, Major Projects
John Smith	Division of Information Technology

Provost Spear called the meeting to order at 8:02 am

He reminded us that this is the Campus Planning Steering Committee we'll be talking about the Campus Master Plan in this session. The minutes from April 21, 2005 will stand approved as corrected.

Gary Brown described that the UW released the draft plan to the public in April, and now we're taking public comment on it. The Joint Southeast Campus Area Committee and the Joint West Campus Area Committee have both been asked to submit written feedback, and will be doing so soon. **Brown** went over the schedule and described how we're adding phasing to it and transportation issues, plus design guidelines. He said that we'll be finalizing the outlines of our final documents now, and working on them over the summer. He reminded everyone of the July 14 and September 14 (final) meetings of this committee.

Alan Fish went over the current map of the plan. He highlighted areas that might be a bit different since last meeting. He described the need to add surge space at the hospital for use during their modular remodeling process, and showed where we think that space might be, off of the southwest or southeast side of the current hospital. He described the future health science campus and the greenbelt along the lake. He described where the plant & animal sciences area of the campus will develop. He showed where buildings for 700-800 beds (for first year students) will be added along the lake. The Food Research programs' relocation into the new Microbial Sciences building frees up space for a lakeside quad among the residence halls there. There are major replacements along Linden Drive, but most of these are the same since last month's meeting. One new idea is to put underground parking at the southwest corner of the Charter and Linden intersection. The Wisconsin Institute for Discovery and Union South parking configuration will be enabled by the displacement of the Physical Plant functions to Lot 51. Fish described the East Campus Mall project. He described the Gordon Commons renovation and how we're testing the idea of extra underground parking below the green space where Ogg Hall is now. The Frances Street Warehouse and parking lot next to

Kohl Center has been very challenging. This area of campus is becoming complicated and putting studio art in the warehouse is ending up being in the way of 3 other big projects – especially utilities projects (substations). There are 69KV power lines running through the parking lot as well. Though we are still struggling with this area, we hope to have some preliminary solutions by July's meeting. Most of this draft plan should be pretty familiar to this committee already. The new green space in front of the entrance to the hospital is another new idea. When the current hospital parking ramp gets old and decaying, we suggest that it be replaced by underground parking topped with a lawn/garden. This will help improve way-finding to the hospital.

Luanne Greene and **Nat Grier** talked about strategies for parking. **Greene** said that the preamble to this discussion is that we want to keep the number of spaces the same across campus (~13,000), paying particular attention to keeping the numbers stable west of Willow Creek. We need to consider how parking structures relate to the other buildings. Academic adjacencies drive a lot regarding where buildings go, but we can be more flexible with parking. It's common sense that constructability, budget (donors don't usually give money for parking structures), and context at any given time will affect how much we can get built and where. They have been working on strategies for dealing with the unknown in regards to parking, and **Nat Grier** will present them.

Grier talked about options that were explored in yesterday afternoon's workshop meetings. He started with the western side of campus, and outlined the option of replacing the hospital's current visitor parking ramp with an underground ramp topped by a lawn/garden. This idea would be a wash with regard to capacity. The footprint for the parking structure next to the proposed Union West has been shrunk down a bit. Another potential parking structure idea that has gone back and forth is the Biotron site. Bus service either east or west would be easy from that site. We had talked about potentially partnering with the Veterans Administration Hospital and Forest Products Laboratory, but we can't really rely on those. The Biotron site puts the ball back in our own court. It would allow us to serve the CALS area of campus better, since the lot in front of Veterinary Medicine may go away with the building of a large and small animal hospital. We can add a couple of levels onto the Steenbock ramp. We might be able to put a sizeable underground ramp at the corner of Linden and Charter. We need to think about traffic flows with this idea. Parking under Humanities could extend as one unit under both new Humanities buildings. Two levels might be possible there. We can add 2 levels to Lot 46 (also known as the Taj garage). We might even be able to put some structured parking under the playing field that will replace Ogg Hall (this has since been ruled out as an option – too costly). This might change how we will recycle the Ogg materials. The Wisconsin Institute for Discovery parking will be a fairly small ramp, maybe just 500 spaces. We are looking for a net-zero outcome.

Greene talked about strategy for getting to this number. We are taking a conservative approach, so as not to over-promise in regards to build-back.

Spear said he wanted to talk about the assumption that we are not going to increase the numbers of parking spaces. We have less parking than our peers of the same size. Why aren't we taking this opportunity to increase the number of parking spaces?

Fish said that there are 2 levels to that answer. First, our parking capacity is not completely full at this time. The Transportation Demand Management strategies have given people other options. Also, we have a hard line that we don't have any student parking on this campus. Only 6,600 out of 21,000 undergrads live on campus. This is also a different dynamic than our peers that takes a bit of pressure off of us. Politically, master plan efforts on this campus in the past have been completely sidetracked by discussions of parking. We decided to keep our parking numbers steady, so as not to make this a central issue that would take peoples' attention away from all of the other crucial issues that need to be re-thought about the campus. If we significantly increased our parking, we might not have the business plan to support it. Our new parking will need to be expensive, and might not be used. Another option used by our peers is adding parking on the fringes of campus. We won't do that because we have residential neighborhoods right at our boundaries and that would anger the neighborhoods. We also simply do not have the necessary land available for new parking structures.

Spear said that we ought to talk about demand. The student body hasn't grown in the past decade. The faculty hasn't grown in the past decade. Staff has grown dramatically, due to large research grants, etc. That will drive a demand for parking among a constituency that is eligible for parking.

Fish said that we've been scratching & clawing to find enough space in the new master plan to keep the structured parking spaces at 13,000. We want to keep the view from Observatory Drive, so we want to consider getting rid of Lot 34. If we can build the Linden Drive garage, we might be able to get rid of Lot 34. However, it may end up that in order to keep 13,000 spaces; we might end up needing to keep Lot 34. We're trying to keep a steady number. There is no way to know right now how this will play out, so we can't lock ourselves in. We need to have a series of choices, so that we can build what will be practical.

Terri Reda said she is the type of person who likes to park right under her building. But, she is interested in the idea of light rail or trolley. She can see herself using things like that instead of driving.

Brown said that we have to remember the Transportation Demand Management measures that we're taking. We have a phenomenal use of these programs already, and we're going to improve them more. These alternatives should help with parking demand quite a bit.

Greene said that we're not considering all under-building or on-site parking. We're testing a variety of options and listing out the pros and cons of each site. Other institutions have the option of cheap fringe parking. We might need to move parking to

the east. We really need to be talking about TDM instead of just parking. **Fish** added that this is why we are doing an overall transportation plan.

Pondrom wanted to know what the plan is for getting rid of the parking between the Red Gym and the Union. She thinks that lot currently serves parents and visitors who are often bewildered and don't know where they are going.

Fish said that the new visitor/welcome center on Park Street will have parking for people right there, even a drive-through for picking up directions and a map. There will also be more parking in the area, under Humanities. We don't want the northern end of the East Campus Mall to end in a parking lot with a dumpster.

Pondrom wanted to know if it would be possible to put some parking under that current parking in this area. **Fish** said it depends on what the Union does with their underground delivery area. He said that a lot of people use the Lake Street city ramp. It's hard to tell what will happen when a lot of other parking arrives in that area (extra floors on Lot 46, University Square rebuild, etc.)

Greene said that one test she likes to use is to think of a process in reverse. If that area were a beautiful plaza already today, we probably wouldn't think of putting parking there instead. **Lance Lunsway** said that we need to reconsider how we use Helen C. White parking areas.

Brown pointed out that the new visitor center has a drive through and they can help people get oriented and find out where to park. **Brown** shifted discussion to open space and turned it over to **Ken Saiki** of Ken Saiki Design, Landscape Architects.

Saiki talked about how the open space system has been continually considered as we've approached the campus master plan, but now we've drawn it out on a map, as a system. He showed a preliminary indication of the area now called the Lakeshore Nature Preserve (formerly the Campus Natural Areas). He showed the spots indicated by the Cultural Landscape Project. Muir Knoll overlaps in both, as do others. We've been preserving and maintaining these throughout the plan. Sports fields have been preserved and we're trying to add some in the east campus. The quadrangle space will be developed, like the area at the Lakeshore Residence Halls, and the health sciences areas. There are also a variety of plazas, courtyards, gardens, pocket parks, etc. He showed both existing and proposed spaces. He talked about the edges of campus. On the east and south, the campus does not control its edges, as they are not contiguously ours. On some areas, we can decide how to add green to them. In other areas, we need to work with neighbors to green them up. We will really need to begin to think of the street grids as open space corridors, and think of them as spaces that people experience outdoors.

Ann Hoyt said that she was coming to this late. There seems to be too little open space next to the warehouse if we're going to put the art program there. Outdoor display space would be important. **Fish** said that the original idea was to put the art program on the education block and have an interior courtyard for art. There is a lot of difficulty getting

funding from the state for an educational art program. We're trying to figure out what will affect our ability to get state funds. We're still considering the block south of Grainger. **Saiki** agreed that we need to have the art complex have significant open space. **Hoyt** said that no matter where it ends up, the assumption should be that the art complex should have outdoor space associated with it.

Fish said that we need to pay better attention to how green we can make our streets in the south campus, since there isn't space for big quads & parks over there. We have to improve the look/experience of the streets. We'll take the green design vocabulary we develop there and extend it to the rest of the campus as well, to create more unity.

Greene said that a lot of the streets in the south east area are hard-working arterials, and it's a challenge to begin changing their feel into green space corridors. **Saiki** talked about how we might go about adding lots of street trees. He said that his firm is involved in working with the city on the Johnson Street project. He showed sketches that involve looking at the city street right of way, and pushing our own building setbacks back, so that we will have room for the same large sidewalks, but also for adding rows of large trees on each side of the bike lane, for instance. It makes a difference in those sites where you have access to creating planting space on the South sides of buildings – these are good growing conditions for trees. Create a large, continuous planter to create a better growing condition for trees. This involves pushing back into the land that we own, to create this space for pedestrians and trees.

Saiki showed the south side of University Ave. and talked about creating a green refuge zone between the bike lane and traffic. Might only have to push back six feet on the north side.

Greene said that they've also done some sketches about the smaller side streets, and how to make them feel like comfortable, green corridors. Make it a different and more urban feel, but still beautiful and very high quality.

Greene brought up the design guidelines. Our talk in this committee last time was very helpful. People talked about spaces they liked, and it seemed clear that the way buildings and open spaces worked together (sense of entry, etc.) was an important theme. So, the consultants threw out their initial outline of design guidelines – they were very conventional, in that they had a separation between building issues and ground issues. Now, the design guidelines will be approached in terms of overall site issues, with attention to how the buildings and surrounding assets blend together. A more comprehensive look at this will be undertaken in July. We're thinking of this holistically, including the utilities master plan.

Greene talked about massing. It has become clear to them that the massing of buildings rather than the architectural style or vocabulary is making the big difference. She showed an "edge study" that they had done on the University of Georgia campus. This will show future builders and planners on this campus what our intentions are in creating building edges that inform open space configurations. She showed some sketches that **Chris**

Rice (from Ayers Saint Gross) did about how the street edges modulate along University Ave & Johnson Street. This will help us consider how to make these areas most vibrant, add retail in helpful places, etc.

We are trying to articulate our values in these guidelines, so that we have a clear definition of what will be driving our response to unique challenges on the campus as they arise in the future.

Saiki showed his first draft of conceptual areas of campus that share particular design challenges. They aren't hard and fast lines yet, just there to help us conceptualize. One is the health sciences area in the west. This area needs concentration on balancing building mass and open space for future development. The west area along Campus Drive will need help from various neighborhoods. Design for physical plant and service areas will be entirely different than other areas. You don't want to invite the public into these or have them very visible. Plant and animal sciences is going to see a lot of development during the next 20 years. They intend to put up some large buildings, and we need to balance the open space there. The urban campus area in the south and east is the area in which we're most "at risk" in terms of creating green spaces. The design guidelines will be very important to keep large projects from pushing out the green space along these corridors. The lakeshore area is a place where the public gets to come into contact with the lake and we feel that this is important.

Spear said that he has spent 20 years here, and pointed out that the consultants have been here a year. (**Saiki** pointed out that he has been in Madison for 50 years.) **Spear** said he thinks that the areas **Saiki** had sketched really do reflect the kinds of areas that exist. **Greene** said that that's why they wanted to start with the open space definition and make the architecture subordinate to this.

Pondrom asked about whether we've thought about the appropriate staffing for physical plant to be able to maintain this amount of green. **Saiki** said that this group and others need to take an advocacy stance and tell the legislature that it's not enough to have buildings but not address the space in between. (The note-taker for the meeting adds that people live their lives in all of this space, not just in the buildings. Students are especially impacted by the spaces between buildings.)

Evelyn Howell hopes that storm water management will be included in the design guidelines, and that the types of vegetation that will be put in are mentioned in the guidelines too. She would like to see us capture storm water to use to irrigate the plantings. She'd like to see a stand-alone section in the guidelines about this. **Brown** said that there will be a whole sustainability section. **Howell** also likes the way **Saiki** drew the zones.

Mary Behan said that on our campus, we look at the maintenance of the green space as someone else's responsibility. Could we look at the European model of taking care of the area outside of our own buildings? **John Harrod** talked about the "adopt-a-block" that

we already have put in place. He invites anyone who would like to “adopt-a-block” to talk with him. **Harrod** talked about the utilities challenge for the design guidelines.

Brown pointed out that the next meeting is July 14. We’ll have a summary of the comments we will have received from the neighborhoods by then, design guidelines and a utilities update.

Meeting adjourned at 9:19 am.

Notes taken by **Gwen Drury**